Presented to the
LIBRARY *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by

ESTATE OF THE LATE
MARY SINCLAIR

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/christianliterat05newyuoft

THE

MAGAZINE

OF

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

VOL. V.

OCTOBER, 1891, TO MARCH, 1892.

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE CO.,
35 BOND STREET,
NEW YORK.

LIBRARY
JUN 22 1965
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

1089031

BR
1
C635
v.5

INDEX TO VOLUME V.

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
America, Impressions of 311
Ancient Beliefs in a Future State, On the. 115
(See also *Immortality, Ancient Beliefs in.*)
Archbishop Ireland's Experiment 212
Authority in Religion, The Seat of 393
Baptists, Universalists, and Unitarians 496
Besant's, Mrs., Doubt, and Her Interview with Dr. Pusey. 385
Bible, The Study of the 245
Biblical Archæology and the Higher Criticism 301
Biblical Science and the Higher Criticism 205
Bibliography 93, 189, 266, 345, 432, 512
Buddhism and Lamaism in Mongolia 329
Carlisle, The Late Bishop of 370
"Chapel," John Wesley's 322
Children, The Conversion of 324
China, A Plea for Fair Play Toward, with the State Paper of the Chinese Government Relative to the Recent Outbreaks 203
China, The Troubles in 70
Christendom, The Reunion of 141, 297
Christian Minister in Politics, The Place of the 360
Christianity, Personal 102
Chronicle, Obituary, and Calendar 96, 192, 269, 350, 435, 515
Church and Labour Problems, The 463
Church Etiquette 250
Church Folk-Lore 483
Church in Her Relation to Labor and Capital, The 241, 463
Church Missionary Society and Bishop Blyth, The 137
Church Organization in New York City 67
Deaconess Work, The 249
Egyptian Family, Life in the 166
Egyptian State, Life in the 171
Entering of the Wedge, The 213
Episcopal Failures 239
Faith and Order of the Church, Relations of the Clergy to the 148
Fourth Gospel, The. (See also *Johannean Question* and *Schürer, Dr.*) 3
Gladstone, Mr., A Story About 255
Graetz, Professor Hirsch 174
Greek Church and Protestant Missions, The; or, Missions to the Oriental Churches 193
Hell, The Christian 215
Hell, The Catholic Church on 320
Heresy-Hunter. The Natural History of the 73
Higher Criticism, The 475
Historic Episcopate, Proofs of an 160
Holy Coat, The 59
"Holy Coats," The Rival 57

PAGE
Hopkins, John Henry, D.D 61
Idolatry, Modern 234
Immortality, Ancient Beliefs in 287
Inspiration 282
Jesuit Methods in Foreign Mission Work 38
Johannean Question, The Present Position of the 411, 441
Kendrick Jubilee, The 334
Koestlin, Julius, Autobiography of, Author of the Life of Luther 65
Kuenen, Abraham 494
Labor and Capital, The Church in Her Relation to 241, 463
Lamentations, The Book of 381
Lay Ministrations in Church 36
Literary Department 81, 177, 255, 335, 418, 500
London Council and Calvinism, The 317
MacQueary Case, End of the 176
Manning, Cardinal, Reminiscences of 449
Margin, Wanted a 498
Missionaries, Ought they to be Married or Unmarried? 238
Moravian Mission in Alaska, The 351
Neale, John Mason 24
Organic Union vs. Inter-Denominational Fraternity 1
Painter and Preacher 134
Palestine About the Year 1400 B.C., According to New Sources 357
Palestine Troubles 35
Paradise, Where was it Situated? 326
Paragraphic 79, 176
Parochial vs. Public Schools—A Significant Incident 63
Peculiar Sect, The Founder of a 227
Probability and Faith 372
Religious Uses of Hardships, The 20
Rescue Mission Work 437
Roman Catholic Church in England, The 110
Schürer, Dr., On the Fourth Gospel 125
Sermons, Why are they Dull? 97
Society of St. John-the-Evangelist, The, and the American Church 391
Spurgeon, Charles Haddon 489
Sovereignty of God, The, in Predestination 404
Sunday-School Lessons, Birth of the 175
Tait, Archbishop 31
Truths and Half-Truths 252
Wealth, The Right Use of 399
Westminster Abbey, Epitaphs in 306
Williams, Roger 271
Women in Islam, The Real Status of 50
Women, Mohammedan 43
"Word of God," The 313

AUTHORS.

PAGE
Ali, Ameer, Justice ... 50
Amos, S. M. S. ... 456
Armstrong, G. D. ... 259
Baird, H. M. ... 422
Barker, Canon ... 360
Barnett, S. A. ... 467
Benham, William ... 31
Bowne, B. P ... 337
Brown, C. R ... 83
Bruce, A. B ... 298
Buckley, J. M ... 399
Buddensieg, R. ... 110
Carlisle, The Late Bishop of ... 372
Chambers, T. W ... 86
Chapman, Charles ... 385
Cheyne, T. K. ... 287
Clark, Thomas M ... 97
Craig, J. A. ... 257
Curtis, E. L. ... 178
Cuyler, Theodore L ... 324
Daland, W. C ... 420
Davidson, Randall T. ... 31
Dawson, W. J ... 311
DeConcilio, Mgr. ... 320
Dix, Morgan ... 313
Dods, Marcus ... 393
Driver, S. R. ... 282
Edwards, Principal ... 491
Eliot, George ... 493
Evans, L. J ... 84, 102
Farrar, Archdeacon ... 141, 234, 306
Fisher, George P ... 252
Gardiner, H. N ... 85, 504
Gates, O. H ... 255, 501
Gerhart, E. V ... 182
Gilbert, G. H ... 181, 255
Gillett, C. R ... 80, 336, 508
Gladden, Washington ... 73
Gladstone, W. E ... 215
Gorst, Sir J ... 466
Gould, E. P ... 177
Green, W. H ... 475
Hamilton, J. Taylor ... 351
Happer, A. P ... 70, 203
Harris, H. R ... 179
Hays, George P ... 1
Hilprecht, Hermann V ... 166, 171
Holman, F. A ... 258
Hommel, Fritz ... 326
Hoyt, Wayland ... 213
Hughes, H. P ... 145
Huntington, George ... 24
Hutton, M. H ... 181, 424
Jackson, S. M ... 422
Jessup, Henry H ... 193
Kedney, J. S. ... 86, 182

PAGE
Kiehle, D. L ... 212
MacArthur, Robert S. ... 400
McConnell, S. D. ... 257
Macdonald, F. W ... 367
McGiffert, A. C ... 84
Manning, Cardinal ... 297
Martineau, James ... 300
Mew, James ... 215
Meynell, W ... 449
Moore, George F. ... 418
Moses, R. G ... 258
Munger, T. T ... 317
Newman, A. H. ... 271
Ninde, William X ... 249
Northrup, G. W. ... 404
Parker, Joseph ... 20, 142
Perry, William Stevens ... 160
Porter, Frank C ... 502
Potter, Henry C. ... 148
Reichardt, Annie ... 43
Richard, J. W ... 423
Riddle, M. B ... 82
Riggs, J. S ... 256
Ripon, Bishop of ... 370
Robinson, W ... 38
Rogers, J. G ... 365
Ruskin, John ... 492
Sanday, William ... 125, 411, 441
Sayce, A. H ... 301
Schauffler, A. F ... 437
Schodde, George H ... 110, 357
Schürer, Emil ... 3
Sellers, Edith ... 227
Shaw, Albert ... 63
Sheepshanks, John ... 329
Smart, H. T ... 470
Smith, H. P. ... 335
Smith, Judson ... 421
Speare, Alden ... 241
Stalker, J ... 134, 381
Stellhorn, F. W ... 256
Stevens, William Arnold ... 205
Stevenson, John J ... 67
Stuckenberg, J. H. W ... 65
Thomas, Jesse B. ... 496
Thompson, Hugh Miller ... 61
Tillett, B ... 472
Toy, C. H. ... 245, 494
Tuckwell, W ... 362
Tulloch, Principal ... 492
Vaux, J. E. ... 483
Wakefield, Bishop of ... 463
Waugh, B ... 459
Wilberforce, Canon ... 369
Zimmer, H ... 357

THE

MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5. OCTOBER, 1891. No. 1.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

ORGANIC UNION *VS.* INTER-DENOMINATIONAL FRATERNITY.

BY REV. GEORGE P. HAYS, D.D., KANSAS CITY, MO., EX-MODERATOR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

IT is so fashionable now to advocate church unity that anything on the other side is apt to be received with serious prejudice. He must expect to be denounced as uncharitable if not unchristian who shall venture to assert that in the present imperfect state of Christian sanctification the present condition of the Protestant world is fairly satisfactory, and for important reasons that condition is much to be preferred to any condition at present attainable in one consolidated organization. In this rage for church unity one denomination by its highest authority has issued a public manifesto advising everybody to unite with it; another denomination has in its highest court a large committee on church unity and federation, and another large committee on church comity, and almost every denomination has the subject up in its various judicatories in one shape or another. All this sentiment is greatly intensified by the enthusiasm of certain gushing people who always attend interdenominational conventions, and whose stock address consists in lamenting divisions in the body of Christ, and in applauding all interdenominational organizations, such as Young Men's Christian Associations, the International and State Sabbath-School Associations, the Y. P. S. C. E. Conventions, the Sabbath Associations, the Tract Societies, the Temperance Associations, etc., because these are leading the way to that happy day when all the denominations shall become one organic body. These gushing enthusiasts seem to hold that one denominational form must be divine and right, and that therefore every other is wrong, and all division is necessarily the sin of schism. With these one passage of Scripture is always quoted with an air of self-conscious assurance, as if it was the conclusive and overwhelming proof that settled the whole question. That passage underlies the proposition of the House of Bishops for church unity on the basis of the Scriptures, the two sacraments, the Nicene Creed, and the historic Episcopate. The passage is John xvii. 21: "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

But does it justify any such application? The first clause of that verse is not a sentence by itself. It is not a statement true irrespective of its connection. It is part of an argument accompanied by an illustration and leading to a conclusion. Do the illustration and preceding premise and succeeding conclusion justify the conviction that the unity there mentioned is the organic, external unity of Christians in contradistinction to the unity and fraternity that now exist between the denominations of Evangelical Christians? The chapter contains the Lord's intercessory prayer for His people; and at verse 20 He enlarges His petition to include not only those that already have believed, but also those who "shall believe on Me through their word: that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Now a Unitarian may truly say that this means church unity without distinction of denomination, just as a Unitarian believes that the oneness of the Godhead is unity without distinction of persons. But the very pivot of the belief of the Trinitarian is that in the Godhead there is spiritual and substantial unity, while between the different persons of the Godhead there is distinction of personality and office work and relationship. Surely those who quote that verse do not mean that it is essential that all external distinctions shall be obliterated between the Church and the Godhead, as according to their interpretation would seem to be meant by the phrase "that they also may be one *in us.*" By what system of organic union can it be made out that the various Christians shall be in *each other* as the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father?

The result prayed for is that the world may be convinced of the presence of Christ in the Church, and thereby be satisfied that Christ was sent of the Father. Formal unity in the shape of organic consolidation would, however, prove precisely the reverse of that which is here suggested. Dead uniformity is not the mark of the work of the Divine Hand. God's plan is external variety with a presence of essential unity. All plants have a similar life, but species differ from species. One species is no more a plant because of its specific peculiarities, nor less a plant because of its specific distinctions. Neither animals nor men are made alike by the Divine Hand. For reasons that are not apparent large numbers of individual birds and beasts will separate themselves from the other members of their own species into their own favorite flocks; and this separation into herds is not to the injury of either the particular drove or the general mass. In some cases these gregarious selections among men have an explanation, but in other cases they are due to inexplicable matters of taste. These denominational differences in the preferences of individual Christians may in some cases have no good reason; in other cases they may greatly tend to Christian growth, personal comfort and spiritual sanctification.

Men often say that the division of the Church into denominations is a great hindrance to outsiders in their attention to religion. Hundreds of outsiders make these divisions the plausible excuse for their neglect. But it is to be noted that no Scripture, either of instruction or example, any more than human experience, gives good ground to believe that this is a fact. The very people who make these differences between the denominations excuses for the neglect of the whole subject would find some other excuse if this was taken away. God, on His own authority, made distinctions for the better organization of His people, when there was no object for it but their good. Even in the wilderness the Israelites were organized into tribes; and when settled in Canaan this division was kept up. Surely no one will say that Benjamin and Judah and the rest should all have been consolidated into one tribe for every purpose. There were twelve apostles; and Paul's objection to the divisions in Corinth was that the attempt was made to make Paul and Cephas and Apollos substitutes for Christ. The Old Testament synagogues were adopted as the model of the New Testament churches; and even in the same cities there were numerous synagogues, as in all the history of the New Testament churches there have been numerous congregations in the same neighborhood.

The evils which are proposed to be remedied by this union of denominations are far more serious as among individual churches than among denominations; and if to remedy these it is important to consolidate denominations, it will be still more important to consolidate congregations. The competition with one another for the favor and patronage of individual persons and families is much more active between individual churches than between the denominations. It is due largely to lack of good sense on the part of the individuals, and their stock of common sense would not be increased by putting them into the same denomination. Nine tenths of the evils of this competition, as it is generally described, exists only in the imagination of the enthusiastic orator, as he describes how other people would work if their souls were no larger than his own. As a fact interdenominational disputes, heated controversies, and angry debates do not exist. They never did exist to the extent to which they have been described. They exist to-day as earnestly in the jealousy and competition and backbiting of ministers and church-members in competing congregations in the same denomination as they ever did between the denominations. The remedy proposed in organic union, even if tried, would therefore be most disappointing.

The theory that external, organic unity is obligatory on the Church, and that every division is schism, is not only unscriptural and inefficient as a remedy for the evils it seeks to cure, but is destructive to the freedom and efficiency of the Church. When that theory becomes dominant, those in power become omnipotent. Whether that power is in the hands of a majority or in the hands of a single individual, it is equally destructive to the influence and freedom of minorities. When Pope Pius IX. proposed to declare in behalf of the Roman Church its belief in the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, thousands of their ablest scholars and bishops remonstrated. Döllinger and others like him were only kept from breaking away to make an effort to establish the "Old Catholic Church" by a plea that this would only be to start another denomination. The Pope had the power and the prelates had not; and under the plea of maintaining external unity the Roman priesthood and people accepted the position before the world, of believing in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception because of the infallibility of the Pope, when, in fact, they knew the Pope was not infallible because he had proclaimed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Precisely so it is with majorities. If they knew that however minorities protested they would do nothing but submit, no limit would be put to their overbearing oppression. Even in the broad sense in which the word Christian is used, each Christian is measurably held responsible for the conduct of every other Christian. In heathen countries Christians are often judged by the drunken sailors that come in the ships which fly the flags of Christian nations. In the narrower sense each individual member of a denomination must accept a measure of responsibility for the position of his denomination. The independent form of church government makes the nearest approach to escape from this oftentimes extremely odious responsibility. Yet independency does not relieve from responsibility, as the Congregational and Baptist churches have learned when they come to deal with immoral and sceptical pastors and congregations. As a practical issue, therefore, the only reasonable solution by which the oppression of universal formal unity is burdened on the one hand, and the temptations to which non-church-membership is exposed on the other, is in the present state of denominational coherence by which Christians having a common belief and agreeing to a common government, accept their share of responsibility for each other; and when dissatisfied take their membership to that other denomination whose doctrine and government they prefer. With these denominational distinctions the indwelling presence of the Deity, as the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, is entirely possible, and to a very large extent is now realized, with a possibility of its being intensified until it finally reaches the maximum, while yet the differences of statements of denominational beliefs and organic administration are maintained.

But it is often asked, Will not the Church of the millennium be a single denomination, and the divisions into denominations which now exist disappear as the final and perfect form of the Church manifests itself? Even if this was true it would be no argument that in the present imperfect state of the Church it ought to take on forms and methods which would be practicable in its perfect state. The very defence made in behalf of nude art and absolute communism is that neither clothing nor individual property existed before the fall, nor will they be needed when mankind cease their sin and selfishness. At present, however, sin and selfishness are as real facts as winters and diseases and hunger. Animals eat what nature provides without cooking; but men cannot avoid starvation without working. The question is not what would be the condition of things and the possibilities of society under different circumstances, with people constituted physically and morally wholly different from what the race now is, but what is best physically, socially, and religiously now that winters chill us and fevers burn us and human infirmities make religious life a struggle and religious peace a problem. Many good people get along fairly well together so long as they do not undertake to live in the same house. It may be said that they ought to be able to live in the same house, but the quarrels that would result from compulsion would be a poor compensation for the peace attained by each having his own house. So, remembering the differing tastes of Christians as to modes of worship and baptism and prayer and preaching, and the differing beliefs about non-essential details of Christian faith, consolidation of all into one denomination and the compulsion of all to abide by a common rule would only hinder Christian growth and destroy Christian peace. The plan is not God's plan in the first place; and in the second place, if it was God's plan for perfectly sanctified Christians, it would not be practicable now with imperfectly sanctified people until God gets done this sanctifying process.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D., KIEL, GERMANY.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), September, 1891.

THE application of the historico-critical method to the books of the Bible appears to many pious Christians even to-day as an attack of scepticism on the Divine word. That these writings, which are plainly regarded as "the Word of God," should be analysed and judged in the same way as other ancient documents is in principle not permissible. The attempt to justify Biblical criticism is regarded as an antagonism betwixt faith and unbelief.

In the circle of educated scientific theologians there are, indeed, very few who now represent this standpoint. The most orthodox believers can no longer disregard the fact that even the Biblical writings are literary productions from the hand of man, which have arisen under conditions quite similar to those of other ancient documents, and are, therefore, to be examined after the same method. The recognition of this fact has brought about a change in the Protestant Church and Theology, greater than any other since the end of last century, and there will be no going back. But, although Biblical criticism is definitely recognised in the circles of scientific theology as right *in principle*, unprejudiced and thorough *application* of the principle is far from complete. Many, indeed most, theologians are still in the mood which we have already indicated as that of the pious laity. The attitude assumed towards Biblical criticism is still one of continuous mistrust, and there is always an inclination to treat the questions which arise, not as questions of historical science, but as questions of faith to be determined by the postulates of faith.

What is here said is true in an exceptional degree of the question respecting *the origin of the Fourth Gospel*. It is certainly one of the most important, indeed the most important, of all the questions that engage New Testament criticism. If the account in the Fourth Gospel be unhistorical, and if we must use the Synoptics exclusively as the source of Gospel history, then the picture of the active life of Jesus will be essentially different from that obtained if we may unconditionally trust the Gospel of the beloved disciple as an authentic source. This undeniable circumstance is, however, regarded by many as though it were simply a question of faith, as though the Christian creed would suffer shipwreck if the Apostle John was not the author of the Fourth Gospel, and as though the authenticity of the Gospel were merely disputed in the interests of unbelief. The history of the newer criticism has taught us, in an ever increasing degree, how untenable is this conception. The more thoroughly and earnestly the peculiar character of the Fourth Gospel has been investigated the more fully have those difficulties which attend the acceptance of its historical character, or its Apostolic origin, been recognised by theologians, who were by no means of the unbelieving or negative type. It is more and more clearly seen that the question treated is not one touching our faith, but a problem of historical investigation. We have not yet advanced so far that the opponents can shake hands; but we are on the way. The defenders of the Apostolic origin admit increasingly, that the account given in the Fourth Gospel is not strictly historical; and the opponents are ready to acknowledge the possibility, indeed the probability, that in some degree an independent historical tradition echoes on in it. The discussions have therefore, passed from the arena of religious strife into the quieter atmosphere of scientific deliberation. May one hope that an understanding will be reached at no distant period? If all signs do not deceive us, this goal, so far as a wide circle of Protestant theologians is concerned, is not very far off. For even apart from this particular question the conviction gains ground that the stability of the Christian faith is not dependent on the question of the genuineness or the circumstances of the origin of the Biblical writings. It is certain that Christian faith existed long before the rise of the New Testament Scriptures, and therefore certain that the Christian faith is not faith in the Bible, but faith in the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

I.

The first attacks on the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel arose towards the end of the last and at the beginning of the present century among the Deists in England, and in Germany among the representatives of the Illumination (Aufklärung—revival of philosophical and theological thought). They brought forth hardly anything which is of importance to-day. Yet one work must be named with honour—a work which attracted attention for the first time so as to command observation to the points which were decisive for criticism—C. Th. Bretschneider's "Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis Apostoli indole et origine" (Lipsiae, 1820). Bretschneider even then, like all modern critics, laid chief emphasis on the difference between the Johannine and Synoptic sayings of Christ. This appears to him so great that he does not think the former can be accepted as the reports of an eye- or ear-witness. But the most of the other difficulties—the universalistic standpoint of freedom from the law, the Greek and philosophical training of the author in comparison with that which we know of the Apostle John, the comparative lack of external evidence—Bretschneider presented then essentially in correct form. He believed that he had thus laid adequate basis for the conclusion that the author of the Gospel could not be an Apostle, but that the work must be that of a post-Apostolic Christian of Greek training.

Bretschneider's book attracted great attention in its time in Germany. Quite a flood of writings appeared in opposition to it. But no permanent effect resulted. There was first an energetic advance and then a general retreat followed. It cannot, indeed, be said that Bretschneider's arguments were actually answered. But the general opposition he met with made such an impression on himself, that he wavered and subsequently withdrew his opinion. The authority of Schleiermacher was of great influence in the formation of opinion in the following decades. This great theologian had taken several opportunities to express himself decidedly in favour of the Apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel.* The "total impression" was for him decisive; the Johannine picture of Christ could not have been invented. There was a similarity here to the portrayal of Socrates by Plato and Xenophon. The sober Xenophon informed us more about externals, but Plato, deeper in mind, initiated us into the inner relationship of the Socratic ideas. So the Synoptics informed us only about the simpler and easily grasped sayings of Jesus, whilst the beloved disciple of kindred soul let us see into the heart of Jesus. The confidence with which Schleiermacher vouched for the authenticity of the Johannine Gospel ruled opinion for a generation. Even so moderate a critic as Credner declared with real enthusiasm for the Johannine authorship. He ventured to say that even if we possessed no tradition respecting the author, we should be compelled to attribute the composition to the beloved disciple, judging simply from the whole manner of the Gospel, the vividness of its account, and its theological and literary character.†

About the same time as Credner's Introduction appeared the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel was again disputed, but the attacks were so summary and superficial as to make no marked impression.*

New lines were struck here, as were also in the whole province of New Testament criticism by the celebrated founder of the Tübingen school, Ferdinand Christian Baur. His epoch-making investigations respecting the Johannine Gospel appeared first in the "Theological Jahrbücher" for 1844, and then in "Critical Investigations regarding the Canonical Gospels" (1847). Baur's criticism was fruitful in that he did not put the question of "genuine or not" in the foreground, but strove first of all to understand the peculiar nature, and the object and literary character of the New Testament writings generally, and of the Fourth Gospel in particular. The key to the understanding of the latter he discovered in the prologue, for the whole presentation of the history was only a free unfolding of the fundamental thoughts expressed there. The world is the kingdom of darkness. By the entry into the world of the divine Logos, arises the conflict between light and darkness. This conflict is not absolute, for there are men in the world susceptible to the "divine light." These accept the Logos, and he makes them God's children. The Logos has always exercised his activity even before becoming flesh. But in an exceptionally intensive way he has exercised it as the Incarnate One. As such he has revealed divine light and life in sensuous form. Thereby the invitation has become more pressing on the one side, and the rejection less excusable on the other. His incarnation brings not only salvation for one, but judgment for another. And the Gospel does not seek to do other than show how, through the self-sacrifice of the incarnate divine Logos, the process of separation fulfils itself. It simply seeks to present this dogmatic idea. The presentation of the history is only a means to this end, and it therefore treats the particulars of the historical tradition with absolute freedom. It is far more like the drama of a poet than the work of an historian. Untroubled about the particulars of the tradition, it sets forth how, according to the presuppositions, the process fulfils itself. The Logos reveals himself from the first in his full glory, in the centre of the Jewish world, in Judæa. He thereby attracts some, the mass he repels. By ceaseless advance of His self-revelation and continuously renewed proofs of His divine glory, the catastrophe eventually arises in which Jesus proves Himself victor over death and darkness. All deviations of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptics Baur believes are to be explained from this fundamental idea. But all these deviations he counts at the same time deviations from actual fact, originating entirely in the Evangelist's free poetic licence. So, according to Baur, it is easily seen that the Gospel cannot be by an Apostle. He finds this confirmed by the whole theological standpoint of the Evangelist who is no Jewish Christian and legalist like the Apostle John, but a Gentile Christian and Universalist. The Gospel indeed presupposes the whole development which early Christianity passed through up to the middle of the second century—the reconciliation of the opposition between Jewish Christianity and Paulinism in the higher unity of the Catholic Church, the rise of Gnosticism, of Montanism, and of the discussions respecting the Lord's Supper. It seeks to lay hold of all these movements and currents, and rule them from its own standpoint, *and cannot therefore have arisen earlier than in the second half of the second century.*

---

* "Addresses on Religion to the Educated among its Despisers" Third edition (with notes), 1821. "Lectures on New Testament Introduction" (delivered 1829-32), published after Schleiermacher's death. 1845.

† "Introduction to New Testament" (1836), p. 208.

* Strauss, "Life of Jesus," 2 vols. 1835. Bruno Bauer, "Criticism of John's Gospel History," 1840. Lützelberger, "Ecclesiastical Tradition respecting the Apostle John." 1840.

In Baur's positions there is, perhaps, as much right as wrong. Valuable views, which cannot be lost again, respecting the object and plan of the Fourth Gospel were disclosed by him. But a satisfactory explanation of all points had not yet been given. The attempt to explain all deviations from the Synoptics as free productions of the imagination on the basis of the theological plan of the Evangelist, without recognition of any sort of historical tradition which may have been at his disposal, cannot be described as successful. And the late date of composition assigned—after the rise of Montanism and the discussions respecting the Lord's Supper—may be shown to be impossible by external testimony. If it be added that Baur produced a shock in other spheres of New Testament criticism by his daring negations, it will be easily understood that he met at first with almost universal opposition. The impression was given of a revolutionary radicalism against which it is necessary to protest with energy. In fact more than twenty years passed before what he had rightly said about the historical character of the Fourth Gospel made an impression on a wider circle. If the exact year is to be given, the year 1867, in which the first volume of Keim's "History of Jesus" appeared, may be indicated as the turning-point. For the splendid defence of Baur's fundamental view by Keim plainly contributed much to enable any competent person to enter on the correct completion of Baur's positions. Until about that year the opposition to the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel remained in the circle of the school of Baur, and was limited to the theologians whose position was nearly related to his. Of Baur's own disciples Schwegler, Köstlin, and Zeller, advocated the views of their master; in part indeed before the public appearance of the master himself.[*] Of the theologians who stand near to Baur, Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, and the Dutch Scholten must be specially cited.[†]

About this time (say 1844–67), outside the circle of Baur's school the view almost generally prevailing, although in various grades and shades, was that the Fourth Gospel was genuine. Some *theories of analysis* which had seen the light shortly before the rise of Baur (1838–41) had found no support and were soon tolerably well forgotten, namely, those by Weisse, Schenkel, and Schweizer. These all conclude that the speeches are genuine, but that the narrative portions are in greater or lesser degree later additions.[‡] All the authors of commentaries to the Gospel of St. John belong to the decided defenders of its genuineness, namely, Meyer (in his "Commentary on the New Testament"), Luthardt (1852–3), Hengstenberg (1861–3), Ebrard (1862), Brückner (1863), and others. We find among these not only some who were determined under all circumstances to defend the tradition in the style of an advocate, but some also who (like Meyer) were ready and well qualified for a sober examination of scientific bases. But there were further, on the side of the defenders, learned men of exceptional scientific reputation and of recognised impartiality in historical judgment. We need only name Bleek, Ewald, Hase and Reuss.[§] Certainly, while they defended the Johannine composition, they did not all, by any means, vouch for the full and unconditional historicity of the contents. And so there were not wanting, even at this time, more or less far-reaching concessions to the critical point of view. Even Luthardt and Brückner acknowledged that the subjective views of the author had not been without influence on the account given, that is so far as the form and content of the communicated speeches of Christ were concerned. Weizsäcker went furthest in the acknowledgment of the subjective character of the Gospel account in his valuable "Investigations respecting the Gospel History," 1864. He sought to show that the portrait of Christ, as here drawn, bears a double character throughout. True, it was based on historical reminiscences. But these were treated everywhere with great freedom. The historical and the ideal tradition and theological reflection were here blended into an indissoluble unity, so that every link of the account allowed of a double interpretation. The historicity of the narrative was, to all intent however, abandoned, and Weizsäcker concluded his investigations with the admission that the Apostle himself was not the author, but that a disciple had composed the Gospel from the traditions of his master. In many respects the view of Renan in his "Life of Jesus" is in touch with that of Weizsäcker, save that Renan prefers a more external analysis. He also finds the unhistorical portions in the speeches of Christ, whilst the external framework of the events is, he holds, essentially historical. Jottings of the latter, he thought might still be attributed to the Apostle. The speeches, on the other hand, "those metaphysical discourses," were insertions by a later hand. The "theory of analysis" appears here, therefore, just in the reverse form to the presentation of it by Weisse, Schenkel and Schweizer. It is not the speeches, but the historical narrative which is Johannine.

---

[*] Schwegler, "Montanism," 1841; "The post-Apostolic Age," 2 vols., 1846. Karl Reinhold Köstlin, "The Doctrinal Conception of the Gospel and Epistles of John," 1843. Eduard Zeller, "The External Testimony respecting the Existence and Origin of the Fourth Gospel" (*Theol. Jahrbücher*), 1845.

[†] Hilgenfeld, "The Gospel and Epistles of John, presented according to their Doctrinal Conception," 1849; "The Gospels in their Rise and Historical Significance," 1854. Volkmar, "The Religion of Jesus, and its Earliest Development," 1857; "The Origin of our Gospels," 1866. Scholten, "The Gospel according to John," 1864 (German translation, 1867).

[‡] Ch. Hermann Weisse, "The Gospel History Critically and Philosophically Considered." Two vols. 1838. "The Present Stage of the Gospels Question," 1856. Schenkel, "Review of the Most Recent Editions of the Life of Jesus" in "Studien und Kritiken," 1840. Alexander Schweizer, "The Gospel of John critically investigated," 1841.

[§] Bleek, "Contributions to the Criticism of the Gospels," 1846; "Introduction to the New Testament," published posthumously, 1862. Ewald, *Jahrbücher* of Biblical Science, III., 1851; V., 1853; "The Johannine Writings," I., 1861. Hase "The Tübingen School—a letter to Baur," 1855; "The Life of Jesus—a manual" (in various editions, 5th edition, 1865).

This was something like the position of criticism in the two to three decades which were dominated in Germany by Baur's school on the one hand, and by the opposition to it on the other. The combating of the Apostolic authenticity of the Fourth Gospel did not reach essentially beyond the circle of Baur's school. Unprejudiced theologians also possessing a free historical perception still held firmly to it. *In the last twenty-five years a complete change has, however, taken place.* "*The denial of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel is that result of the Tübingen school which has secured most assent far beyond the circle of its special adherents.*" So says Bernhard Weiss with full justification in his "Introduction to the New Testament" (p. 616), and he is a decided defender of the genuineness. But not only has the number of opponents increased, the contending parties have also come a good deal nearer to one another. Those who dispute the genuineness have given up a number of Baur's untenable assertions. It is recognised that the Gospel is at least some thirty to forty years older than Baur admitted; that it arose not 160–170 A.D., but at latest about 130 A.D.; that it was not simply a poetical product, but that to a greater or less extent it used other traditions which were existing parallel to the Synoptics; and that finally even the difference between the Johannine and Synoptic picture of Christ, whilst great, is not so marked as Baur had drawn it. On the other side it is recognised, in a growing degree, even by the most decided of the defenders of the genuineness, that the historical material has here undergone some remodelling through the subjectivity of the Evangelist; that the history is not for the Evangelist an end in itself, but the means of presenting his ideas. The points of view which Weizsäcker once indicated have already pressed far towards the position of complete acceptance. *Thus the present condition of the question shows a gradual and mutual approach of opponents.*

As already remarked, the great work of Keim, "The History of Jesus of Nazareth" (three vols., 1867–72), contributed essentially to this result. In the first volume, when speaking of "Sources," he also presented a thorough investigation of the character and origin of the Fourth Gospel. His view of the question is very like Baur's. The position of the latter, however, freed here from its excrescences and manifest defects, made a greater impression in its new form than in its first advocacy by Baur himself. Keim acknowledges that the external evidence compels us to place the Gospel considerably earlier than Baur did, for Justin Martyr (*cir.* 140–150 A.D.) knew it in his time. The references to Montanism and to the discussions about the Lord's Supper, which Baur asserts are in the Gospel, Keim surrenders. In forming an estimate of the plan and theological character of the Gospel, several of Baur's venturesome assumptions are withdrawn. Keim, for example, over against Baur's one-sided

---

Reuss, "The History of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament" (in various editions, 4th edition, 1864, 5th edition, 1874).

emphasis of the Greek character of the Evangelist's theology, does greater justice to points of contact with Old Testament Jewish thought. He therefore declares that it is probable the Evangelist was of Gentile and not of Jewish descent. He also acknowledges that remnants of historical tradition are contained in the Gospel, notwithstanding the fact that he lays stress on its unhistorical character.

Among the large number of critics who during recent decades have declared *against the Apostolic origin* of the Fourth Gospel are to be found theologians of very different schools; not simply such as have been more or less influenced by Baur, but those also who have arisen from the ranks of his opponents. This is surely a symptom which indicates that the antithesis no longer dominates New Testament criticism generally. Of the theologians influenced by Baur we may cite (though with some reservation) Hausrath, H. J. Holtzmann, Thoma, Pfleiderer, Oscar Holtzmann.[*] Among these, H. J. Holtzmann especially, has furnished valuable contributions to the solution of the Johannine problem, and in a similar way to Keim, he has modified the positions held by Baur. The others move essentially on the same line. Thoma, however, has, by his wild fancies, by means of which he sees nothing but allegory in the Gospel from beginning to end, even down to the most trifling particulars, furnished proof that science at times deviates from the straight course. Among theologians of another school, Hase and Weizsäcker are the chief. They have so changed their earlier positions that they are now distinctly to be reckoned among the opponents of the genuineness of the Gospel.[†] Nearly related to these, in their general conception, are Mangold and Immer.[‡] The former must be described as an extremely prudent and conservatively inclined theologian, and his secession to the camp of the opponents is a significant symptom in the history of our question. But a number of other theologians also, without publishing thorough investigations, have admitted in incidental notes, that they were no longer able to hold to the presupposition of Apostolic origin.

As an indication that doubts respecting the historicity of our Gospel have laid hold of a wide circle, one may cite the revival of the "theory of analysis," by Wendt. He not only cuts out pieces not considered genuine, but holds the genuine parts to be historical only in a qualified sense.[*]

Of still more significance, perhaps, than the growing number of the opponents, is the circumstance that *the defenders* also make stronger and stronger admissions as to the unhistorical character of the Gospel. There are still some, certainly, who maintain the full historicity, *e.g.*, Godet (various editions), Keil (1881), Schanz (1885), and Wahle (1888), in their commentaries. But beside these stand theologians of conservative bent who, whilst distinctly defending the Apostolic origin, find themselves compelled to admit that the Evangelist does not draw the portrait of Jesus as He actually was, but as He appeared to the Apostle's ripened faith and knowledge. Luthardt and Grau have expressed themselves on this point in very strong words.[†] The two most respected defenders of the genuineness in recent decades, Beyschlag and Weiss, go still further in acknowledgment of the subjective remodelling of the history by the Evangelist.[‡] Their view comes very near to that of Weizsäcker, so that the question arises how it is possible with such a general conception to maintain the Apostolic origin.

The situation here set forth is only so far as Germany is concerned. In other countries, for example in England, the defenders are in a large majority. Among opponents, who have busied themselves very thoroughly with the problem, one may name, say, Tayler, the anonymous author of "Supernatural Religion," and Samuel Davidson;[§] and we may cite among defenders, Westcott, Sanday, Reynolds, Hutton, Gloag, and the late American theologian, Ezra Abbot.[‖]

---

[*] Hausrath, "History of New Testament Times," second edition. Vol. IV., 1877. Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, "Manual of Introduction to the New Testament," second edition, 1886, in the "Hand-Commentary to the New Testament," Vol. IV., 1891; and numerous papers in "Hilgenfeld's Magazine for Scientific Theology," and other Magazines. Thoma, "The Origin of John's Gospel," 1882 Otto Pfleiderer, "Primitive Christianity: its Scriptures and Doctrines," 1887. Oscar Holtzmann, "John's Gospel Investigated and Explained," 1887.

[†] Hase, "History of Jesus," 1876. Weizsäcker, "The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church," 1886.

[‡] Mangold in his edition of Bleek's "Introduction to the New Testament." Third Edition, 1875; fourth edition, 1886. Immer, "New Testament Theology," 1877.

[*] Wendt, "The Doctrine of Jesus," two vols. 1886–90.

[†] Luthardt, "The Johannine Origin of the Fourth Gospel," 1874. Grau. "History of the Development of New Testament Literature," 2nd vol., 1871.

[‡] Beyschlag. "The Johannine Question," 1876; "Life of Jesus," two vols., 1885–6. Bernhard Weiss, in his edition of "Meyer's Commentary," 1880; "Life of Jesus," two vols., 1882; "Manual of Introduction to New Testament," 1888.

[§] J. J. Tayler, "An Attempt to Ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel," 1867: "Supernatural Religion," 2nd vol. (various editions). S. Davidson. "An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament," two vols., 1868; second edition, 1882.

[‖] Westcott, "Introduction to the Study of the Four Gospels" (various editions), and in "Speaker's Commentary," 1880. Sanday, "The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel; the Gospels in the 2nd Century," 1876. Reynolds, in the "Pulpit Commentary," 1888. Hutton, "Essays, Theological and Literary," 1st vol. (Essay VII., "The Historical Problems of the Fourth Gospel"). Gloag, "Introduction to the Johannine Writings," 1891. Ezra Abbot, "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and other Critical Essays," Boston, 1888.

The situation in England differs from that in Germany, in that both *pro* and *con* the chief stress is still laid in England on the proof of the Johannine authorship from external evidence, whilst in Germany the contest has moved more and more from the realm of external evidence to that of the internal.*

While we seek further to set forth *the grounds* for their conclusions, which are brought to the front alike by opponents and defenders of the genuineness, we shall endeavour to allow the contending parties, as far as possible, to speak for themselves. We cannot avoid, however, in a narrative like this, our own interpretation showing itself at points, for it is apparent at once in which direction the tongue inclines.

In German literature, at least, the greatest space is occupied by the discussion of *internal evidence.* And rightly so, for that is decisive. Even the best external evidence would scarcely be in a position to set aside the weight of internal evidence if this were against the Johannine authorship.

The grounds of internal evidence may in general be brought under two heads :

(A) The Gospel of John and the Synoptics.

(B) The Gospel of John and the Apostle John.

(A) What does a comparison of our Gospel with the Synoptics teach us respecting its historical character? That is the chief question to be put to-day. It is acknowledged that the three first Gospels contain in great part the same material, the same narratives, and the same sayings of Jesus Christ. It must, therefore, be admitted that they go back on one or more common sources. That which is distinctive of any one of the three Evangelists, in addition to the common elements, arises either from his special way of utilising the sources, or is to be attributed to the possession of other written or oral information. But in the Fourth Gospel the matter of the book is almost altogether different—different narratives and different speeches. Only a small portion of the narrative of the three first Evangelists is to be found in John. The most of what John narrates is peculiar to his Gospel, and this is true in a still higher degree of the speeches. Only one Synoptic saying here and there do we meet with again in the Fourth Gospel; the speeches here have different contents almost throughout. This phenomenon, which strikes one at once in the most casual reading, allows of a double interpretation, which it has, in fact, received. Some say if this material, that is these speeches, were historical, stronger traces of them would be discoverable in the Synoptics. Others say just the reverse—the fact that the fourth Evangelist furnishes new material is proof that he possessed independent historical information. So long as the material is regarded only *quantitively*, the latter are decidedly right. If the quality of the material be not taken into consideration, then a mere balance in quantity raises a prepossession in its favour. As a matter of fact, phenomena appear here which the defence quite rightly turns to its own account. In the Fourth Gospel we come across several details, which neither produce the impression that they are legendary, nor that they have been invented in the interest of any theological idea, and which, therefore, can only be understood as constituent parts of a real historical tradition. Such are—*e.g.*, Bethsaida as the place of abode of Andrew and Peter (i. 44) ; Bethany, on the other side of Jordan, and Ænon, near to Salim, as the place where John baptised (i. 28, iii. 23) ; the statement that John was not yet cast into prison when Jesus entered on His ministry (thoroughly probable in itself) ; that Jesus withdrew Himself to Ephraim before the last Passover ; that He was examined by Annas, and other things of this kind. These are all historical memoranda, whose historicity there is not the slightest ground for doubting. They speak decidedly for the Evangelist having at his command another tradition independent of the Synoptics.

But along with this independence in material it strikes us all the more that the Evangelist, in those portions which are common with the Synoptics, *is verbally dependent on them.* The number of such portions is not great. But in every one of them strong formal points of connection with the Synoptics are to be discerned—*e.g.*, in the sections *re* John the Baptist (i. 19–34) ; the purification of the Temple (ii. 13–16) ; the nobleman of Capernaum (iv. 47–54) ; the feeding of the five thousand (vi. 1–21) ; the anointing in Bethany (xii. 1–8) ; and generally in the history of the Passion. If these Johannine portions are compared with the parallel sections of the Synoptics, several somewhat strong deviations in matter of fact will be found in conjunction with a harmony in many verbal details all the more surprising. That there is here a literary dependence of the one on the other there can be no doubt, and the fact is almost generally recognised. Similarly, it is almost generally admitted that the fourth Evangelist is the later. But some believe that even an Apostle, who in later times added something new to the already existing Gospels, might very easily be so influenced verbally. Others again think it evident that we have here the composition of a later author, who derived his knowledge of the Gospel history essentially from the Synoptics, but remodelled it in very free fashion. Strict proof of this cannot indeed be furnished. But, it may be said, that literary dependence on the Synoptics is very strange for an Apostle.

---

* On the negative side, for example, the author of "Supernatural Religion" has laid great stress on the lack of external evidence ; and on the affirmative side Ezra Abbot has specially sought to present the proof from that source.

As distinguished from these external differences and points of contact, the far-reaching qualitative difference in material, *the actual deviations in the account*, are of far greater weight, and this just as much in the course of the history as in the speeches of Christ.

(1) *As to the Course of the History.*—And, first of all, important differences may be established, in which the internal evidence is perhaps in favour of the Johannine quite as much as, if not more than, the Synoptic account—we mean the differences as to the *journeys to the feasts*, and the *day of Jesus' death*.

According to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus during His public ministry is frequently back and forward between Galilee and Judæa, in that He travels from Galilee where He dwells to Jerusalem to the great feasts, and each time returns thence, after a longer ministry, to the North. The statements of the Gospel in reference to this are very full. Three times Jesus goes to Jerusalem: first to the Passover (ii. 13), then to a feast not named (v. 1), and, finally, about the time of the Feast of Tabernacles in autumn (vii. 14). Then in the interval, also, a Passover is cited to which Jesus did not go up (vi. 4); so between the first and third journey there is a year and a half. Jesus did not return to Galilee again after the last journey, but went about in Judæa and on the other side of Jordan, until the Passover when He was crucified. The public ministry of Jesus thus occupies a little more than two years. The Synoptics say nothing of all these events. They only tell of His ministry in Galilee, and make Him travel to Jerusalem for the first time to that Passover in connection with which His earthly ministry ended. Of a longer and more frequent ministry in Judæa they tell us nothing, and they give just as little indication of the length of Jesus' public ministry. Now Baur, in particular, endeavours to explain the frequent visits to Jerusalem from the plan of the Evangelist—the latter postulates them because he wishes Jesus' appearance to be in the centre of the Jewish world. As a matter of fact, it is not to be denied that the Evangelist lays great stress on Jesus' appearance on the stage of action in Jerusalem (*cf.* especially vii. 3). But all the details are not explained in this way. And on the other side, it has rightly been shown, that even in the Synoptic narrative there are single facts which presuppose a longer activity in Jerusalem. It is on the whole improbable in itself too, that Jesus, who still observed the law (Matt. xvii. 24), should for any length of time have failed to go up to Jerusalem to a feast. The position of the apologists for the Gospel is therefore, to say the least, not an indefensible one.

A similar judgment might perhaps be given in reference to the *day of Jesus' death*. It is very remarkable that our Gospels are not agreed as to whether Jesus was crucified on the 14th or 15th of Nisan—*i.e.*, whether the meal of which He partook with His disciples on the evening before His death was the Jewish Passover, or whether the Passover occurred on the evening of the day of crucifixion. To many exegetes and critics it appears impossible generally that a difference on this point could exist between the Evangelists, and on this account they seek by ingenious explanation to put the difference aside. But facts are stubborn, and do not yield to our wishes. No unprejudiced person can disregard the fact that Jesus' meal with His disciples on the evening before the crucifixion was, according to the Synoptics, the Jewish Passover (Matt. xxvi. 17 ff., Mark xiv. 12 ff., Luke xxii. 7 ff.); that, *vice versâ*, according to John, the Jewish Passover did not occur until the evening of the day of crucifixion (John xiii. 1, xiii. 29, xviii. 28, xix. 14). All the learning which has been applied to reversing the apparent sense of these passages is vain. No doubt can remain respecting them in the unprejudiced mind. But which is the true tradition, the Synoptic or the Johannine? That is a question which cannot well be decided with certainty, for as much is to be said for the one account as for the other. The opponents of the authenticity of the Johannine story point to the fact that all that is said by the Synoptics respecting the Last Supper, the preparation for it, and the whole event itself is inextricably interwoven with the assumption that it was the Jewish Passover. It is of no use disputing a *single* statement; the kernel of the narrative must be assailed if the account is to be denied. Can there have been formed in the bosom of the earliest Christianity, up to the time of the composition of the writing which is at the basis of our Synoptic Gospels, an opinion so unhistorical respecting this solemn and important event? On the other hand, the remodelling of the tradition by the fourth Evangelist is easily understood. He is not wishful to represent Jesus as an observer of a Jewish ceremony, but to exhibit Paul's thought that Jesus Himself had died as the true Passover offering (1 Cor. v. 7). So Jesus is crucified, according to him, on the day on which the Passover Lamb was to be slain. So say the opponents of the Johannine account. The defenders of John's Gospel say the Synoptic account is not decisive, for none of our three first Gospels was written by an Apostle. They lay great stress in turn on the fact that, according to the Synoptic account, the day of crucifixion would have been a great feast-day. For the feast itself began with the celebration of the Passover meal on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, and the following day was like a Sabbath. It is, they say, in the highest degree improbable that the condemnation and execution of Jesus would have been pressed through by legally minded Jews on such a day. For the Jewish law expressly forbids any trial in Court on a Sabbath or feast-day.*

In general, too, the haste with which the matter is dealt with by the Jews is only to be understood if there was a desire to finish it before the commencement of the feast. The release of Barabbas by Pilate also indicates that the commencement of the feast is still ensuing, for the release of a prisoner at this time means, evidently, that the person referred to may still be able to celebrate the feast with his friends. These instances are, in fact, in the highest degree important. And however difficult it may be to hold that the kernel of the Synoptic account is unhistorical, yet it must be distinctly granted that the Johannine narrative is internally the more probable. One can only say that the evidence *pro* and *con* is here evenly balanced.

The judgment is much more unfavourable to the Gospel of John, however, if we fix our eyes on *the general construction of the Gospel history—i.e.*, on *the progressive way in which Jesus appears as Messiah.* In the treatment of the Johannine question this point has frequently failed to receive due attention, but it is one of the most important and decisive of all. That its significance has not been generally acknowledged is to be explained partly by the peculiarity of our Synoptic Gospels. Our Matthew and Luke, for example, have obliterated on this point the account of the oldest source. On the other hand, in Mark, which, without question, has retained most faithfully the account of the oldest source, it is perfectly clear that *Jesus only avowed Himself as Messiah late in His ministry, and by degrees.* Three points may here be noticed:—

(*a*) *Jesus Himself* is, from the beginning of His public appearance, inwardly certain of His divine calling. He even demands that He be approached trustfully, that His preaching be believingly accepted, and that in Him help be sought, trusting that God offers grace and succour through Him to men. But only in this sense does He demand faith. He did not advance the claim to be Messiah for a long time. If He was inwardly certain of His Messiah ship, then with a true teacher's wisdom, He shunned for long to declare it, because He knew well that the people had a different conception of Messiah's office from His. They thought of it more in a political than a religious sense.

(*b*) To this attitude of Jesus corresponds that *of the disciples.* They are seized by the power of His preaching, and attach themselves to Him as scholars to a teacher without having any presentiment about His Messiahship. How far they were from any knowledge of this kind is shown most forcibly by the exclamation at the stilling of the storm (*cf.* Mark iv. 41): "What manner of man is this (verbally, 'Who then is this?') that even the wind and the sea obey Him?" Such a question of astonishment would have been impossible if they had already recognised in Him the Messiah, or if they had even had a weak faith in His Messiahship. In full accord with this we have the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi (Mark viii. 29). The solemn fashion in which this confession is cited as an important and decisive act shows clearly that we have here the first declaration of it. In Matt. xvi. 17 the following sentence occurs, too, in the answer of Jesus: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven." The knowledge won is here expressly advanced as new. It is very probable that this sentence is from the oldest source. If, however, this were not the case it rightly represents the situation. For the first time the disciples have now recognised Jesus as Messiah. But even now He does not appear publicly as such. He expressly forbids the disciples to speak of it, because His coming forward with the title of Messiah is still forbidden in the interests of the people, who need training to the idea. Not until quite the end of His ministry does He allow the multitude to do homage to Him as Messiah. At the trial before the Sanhedrim He finally confessed Himself Messiah, even in presence of His enemies.

---

* According to the Mishna no court was to be held on Sabbaths or feast-days (Beza v. 2), and not on the day before in criminal cases; because in such cases the judgment was pronounced on the day after the hearing of the case (Sanhedrin, iv. 1). This command not to hold court is narrowly observed, too, by the Jews of the dispersion. As chief points of what is forbidden on the Sabbath, Philo cites by way of example:—"Lighting a fire, labouring in the field, carrying a burden, *bringing a charge or giving a decision* in court, or calling in deposits or loans." (De migratione Abrahami, §16, Opera ed. Mangey L., 450: *πυρεναύξειν ἢ γεωπονεῖν ἢ ἀχθοφορεῶ ἢ ἐγκαλεῖν ἢ δικάζειν ἢ παρακαταδήκας ἀπαιτεῖν ἢ δάνεια ἀναπράττειν.*) The Jews of Asia Minor obtained from Augustus a decree that they should not be compelled to appear in court on the Sabbath (Joseph. Ants. xvi. 6. 2: *ἐγγύας τε μὴ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν σαββασιν ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ ἀπὸ ὥρας ἐνάτης*, xvi. 6. 4; *ἵνα σάββασι μηδεὶς ἀναγκάζῃ Ἰουδαῖον ἐγγύας ὁμολογεῖν*). For Rabbinical passages respecting the command not to hold court on the Sabbath, *cf.* Ritter, "Philo and the Halacha" (1879), p. 130.

(c) In accordance with all this there is finally *the attitude of John the Baptist*, as recorded in the oldest source. According to Matt. iii. 14, 15, John indeed recognised Jesus, even at the Baptism, as the "mightier" One, and therefore refused to baptise Him. But the oldest source knew nothing of this. Neither Mark nor Luke relate this episode. It is certainly a later addition of the first Evangelist. According to the account in Mark i. 9–11, with which Luke iii. 21, 22 essentially agrees, John the Baptist received no revelation at the Baptism respecting Jesus. It was Jesus who saw the Heaven open and the Spirit descending upon Himself, and the voice from Heaven, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," was only directed to Jesus. The meaning of the incident was that Jesus was equipped by the Spirit, and thoroughly assured of His Sonship to God. That John had any knowledge of this is not said. It was not until he was in prison, and heard of the mighty works of Jesus, that there came to him a presentiment that this perhaps might be the Messiah. Then he sent his disciples to Jesus to ask, "Art thou He that should come" (Matt. xi. 2 ff., Luke vii. 18 ff.). The most of the commentators understand this expression as though John had become doubtful again. This conception is, however, probable neither according to the verbal statement nor according to the context of the Synoptic narrative. The question of John is not the question of one who has grown doubtful, but of one in whom the spark of faith is beginning to glimmer for the first time. All this furnishes a thoroughly harmonious picture. *In the earliest time of Jesus' public ministry there is nothing said of His Messiahship. Only step by step is this advanced; and only step by step does the knowledge of it dawn on those closely associated with Him.* This is the account of the oldest source, and it has throughout internal probability in its favour.

How is it now with this point *in the Fourth Gospel? The account there is in every respect the exact opposite.*

(a) Jesus appears from the very first with a full claim to Divine Sonship and Messiahship. One of His first deeds is the driving out of the traders and money-changers from the Temple (ii. 14–17). This powerful interference with the police regulations of the Temple presupposes the absolute consciousness of His own higher authority. And not merely the consciousness of this, but also the intention to publicly appear with a vindication of it. Whilst Jesus interferes in such an autocratic fashion with earthly ordinances, He appears publicly as one who has higher power than the high priests and scribes. It is quite in harmony with the representation of Jesus given by the Synoptics that they do not narrate this event until quite the end of the Gospel history (Matt. xxi. 12 ff., Mark xi. 15 ff., Luke xix. 45 ff.). In John it stands at the outset of the history. Can any one doubt which is the historical passage? And if the account of the Fourth Gospel is unhistorical in only one important point, is it possible to accept a disciple of Jesus who had lived through it all as the author? This would indeed be very difficult if the defect were an isolated instance. But it is by no means so. The whole of the remaining account in the Fourth Gospel is in harmony with this fundamental difference. Whilst, according to the oldest Synoptic source, Jesus did not come forward as Messiah until late in His ministry, and only by degrees, He appears in John from beginning to end with the same claim to an unique divine authority. That He should be acknowledged as the Son of God, who was with the Father before the foundation of the world, and who now is sent from the Father to bring the full revelation—this is the fundamental claim which Jesus puts forward from the beginning, and always in the same way. And this fundamental claim also is from the first responded to by some believing souls.

(*b*) *The first disciples* attach themselves to Jesus, not simply as scholars to a teacher, but they follow Him *because they have recognised in Him the Messiah.* "We have found the Messias," says Andrew to his brother Simon (i. 41). "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write," Philip tells Nathanael (i. 45). The disciples have here therefore the knowledge of the Messiahship of Jesus from the first; indeed, this is the reason for their being His disciples.

(*c*) But *John the Baptist* recognised in Jesus the promised Messiah before the disciples did so. He does not simply, as he does for the most part in the Synoptics, point to one "mightier" who will come after him; he recognises this mightier one in Jesus immediately Jesus appears, and indeed he is instructed respecting this by the events at the Baptism. Whilst, according to the oldest Synoptic source, these incidents are known to Jesus only, and are only intended for Him, they are, according to the Fourth Gospel, essentially intended for the Baptist, and are to testify to him respecting Jesus' Messiahship and Sonship to God. "I knew Him not; but He that sent me to baptise with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God" (i. 33, 34). So John is from the first a strong and assured witness for the Messiahship of Jesus. He is the first to whom this has been revealed, and it is consequently his calling to bear witness of it henceforth to the world.

The Synoptic account and the account of the Fourth Gospel are each thoroughly consistent in all these points. *But it is clear that these two pictures are mutually exclusive.* In one case, you have a gradual disclosure of Jesus as the Messiah, in the other case, an immediate recognition of this office. If the first picture is historical the second cannot be, and he who draws it cannot have been an Apostle—an immediate disciple of the Lord. This dilemma is almost universally recognised. The defenders of the genuineness must therefore undertake the task of proving the second picture historical. It cannot, however, be asserted that this task has been satisfactorily fulfilled. Appeal is made to the fact that even Matthew and Luke, and especially perhaps Matthew, presuppose a recognition of the Messiahship by the disciples and immediate followers—particularly by John the Baptist—at the very first appearance of Jesus. So far as concerns Matthew that is essentially correct. But on purely literary grounds, it is probable that Matthew has not preserved for us, in this point, the account of the oldest sources, that this rather is before us in Mark. Here, therefore, are difficulties for the defenders, which have not yet been satisfactorily explained, and are by no means easy of explanation.*

(2) The case is similar in reference to the second chief point, in which our Gospel deviates from the Synoptics—in reference to *the contents of the speeches of Jesus.* The difference is just as penetrative here as in reference to the course of the history. The themes treated in the two are quite different. In the Synoptics, the preaching of Jesus groups itself round the kingdom of God as the fundamental conception. Jesus appears with the tidings that the dawn of this kingdom is at hand, and He points to the change of mind which is necessary on the part of any who would participate therein. Almost all the sayings and parables, therefore, either speak of the nature of the kingdom of God, or they explain the moral claims on its members. The kingdom of God is the *summum bonum.* The "goods" of the kingdom are not external, political or material, however, but inward, religious and moral—the fatherly love and grace of God, which forgives the sin of all those who draw near to Him as children, and bestows on these in overflowing goodness all they need. Men are straightway brought into the enjoyment of these "goods" through the activity of Jesus. The realisation of the kingdom of God has, therefore, begun already. It is developed from the smallest beginnings by degrees and without observation. It becomes growingly strong and more widely extended, until finally, at the end of this age, it is established in its full glory. This emphasis on the inward character of the kingdom of God and its gradual development expressly sets aside and combats the usual Jewish conception; and the same may be said of the conditions of entrance to the kingdom. The righteousness of the disciples of Jesus must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees. Their life must not simply be outwardly correct, but must spring from a right disposition—from perfect love, love to God, and love to neighbours. Only he who renounces every private interest, every per-

---

* It is self-evident that if our reproduction of the Synoptic picture is historical the stories of the childhood of Jesus, in Matthew and Luke (Matt. chaps. i. and ii., and Luke chaps. i. and ii.), cannot be historical as well. But against these there is so strong a misgiving, arising in other ways, that their historicity is surrendered by several conservative critics.

sonal advantage, and pursues no other end in life than the service of his neighbour, is a child of the heavenly Father, and can have part in the kingdom of God. Since it is through Jesus, however, that introduction to the kingdom is possible, and through Him that the kingdom itself is made real, the attitude men assume to Him is by no means without influence on their destiny. Jesus is the confidant of the heavenly Father through whom the Father fulfils His loving will. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22). Through Him the coming to God and the consequent attainment of salvation are mediated. Therefore, trustful attachment to Him is of decisive significance for the destiny of men. "Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but Him that sent me" (Mark ix. 37, Matt. x. 40, Luke ix. 48; *cf.* also Luke x. 16). "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. x. 32, 33, Luke xii. 8, 9; *cf.* also Mark viii. 38, Luke ix. 26). "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me" (Matt. xi. 6, Luke vii. 23).

The latter set of sayings form the zenith of Jesus' judgment of Himself in the Synoptics. Their number is small almost to vanishing point in comparison with the mass of other contents of the preaching of Jesus. They are completely overlaid, therefore, by the impression which the Synoptic Gospels give. In the Gospel of John it is quite the reverse. Here these thoughts form the subject of almost all the speeches. Almost all that Jesus says here consists of variations on the theme that He alone knows the heavenly Father, and can reveal Him to the world; and that therefore acceptance or rejection of His word is decisive for the destiny of men. Whosoever accepts Him has light and life; whosoever accepts Him not is judged already. There is scarcely anything in the Fourth Gospel of all the rich content of the Synoptic preaching of Jesus, of all that is said respecting the nature and development of the kingdom of God; and respecting the better righteousness which is the condition of participation in the kingdom. The difference indicated is not simply quantitative, but those self-revelations by Jesus respecting the significance of His person, the groundwork of which is to be found indeed in the Synoptics, have increased, and have received a quite different theological setting. The nature of salvation here consists essentially in the perfect revelation, in the perfect knowledge of God Through light comes life. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (viii. 32). Jesus however, and Jesus alone, brings this revelation. Therefore the acceptance of His word is from the first the cardinal question here in a quite different way from its being such in the Synoptics. In the Synoptics the essential demands are love of God and love of your neighbour, whereas in John there is in the foreground the formal demand of acceptance of the person of Jesus. Besides, the oneness of Jesus with His heavenly Father is placed here on an entirely different basis from that in the Synoptics. In the latter it is thought of in a purely ethical sense; Jesus is initiated into the thoughts of the Father, and the Father into those of the Son. In the Fourth Gospel this is still a chief point. But the ethical union rests here on the metaphysical. Jesus' existence did not date its beginning from His human birth, but even before the foundation of the world He was with God as a second divine potency, that is as the Logos (Word) of God, which is itself God.* The historical person Jesus is no more than the phenomenal appearance of the divine Logos in the flesh. He has, therefore, been with His Father long before His birth. He has come from above, descended from heaven. *Therefore* is He in the secret of the Father's thoughts; *therefore* is He, and He alone, in the position to bring the full revelation. The Synoptics know nothing of this metaphysical basis for the ethical union of Jesus with His Father. There is not the smallest trace of this thought in Jesus' declarations respecting Himself according to the Synoptics.

Is this important deviation of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptics not at the same time a deviation from the true history? This question is a growingly urgent one in all decisions respecting the authenticity of the Johannine Gospel. But, just on this point, a very general understanding has already been attained between the opponents and defenders of the genuineness. It is recognised by all prudent defenders of the genuineness that the Johannine speeches of Christ are not really historical reports, that single points rather have been been taken from the preaching of Jesus, and remodelled by the particular subjectivity of the Evangelist not simply as to form, but as to content also. The measure of this remodelling is the only really debatable point. One party believes it is only of such a kind as is thinkable in the case of a personal disciple; the other denies this. The more earnestly and conscientiously the particular points are considered the more difficult is it to adhere to the former conception.

---

* The Greek expression "Logos" (John i. 1) is translated in Western versions of the Bible by "Word." It might just as well be translated "Reason" (Vernunft), for the Greek expression signifies both, and the notion which lies at the basis of the conception of Logos allows of both modes of translation. The starting-point of the Logos idea is not simply the thought that God works by His word—His speaking—(Gen. i.), but that He works through His reason, His wisdom (Prov. viii. and ix.). This active medium of God's life and work is thought of as an independent existence, as a second divine potency by the side of God Himself. God, who is in Himself hidden, works outwardly through the mediation of the Logos. That is the idea which had been developed under strong influence from Greek philosophy in the circles of Hellenistic Jews previous to the time of our Evangelist, and was taken up as a known and current idea, and employed by him for his theological purpose.

(B) We have now exhausted the chief questions which present themselves in a comparison of our Gospel with the Synoptics. Questions of a weighty kind are also raised, however, *when we compare the theological and literary character of our Gospel with what we know of the Apostle John.*

Among those weighty questions we scarcely need reckon *the alleged ignorance of Palestinian and Jewish affairs,* from which Bretschneider and Baur inferred that the author was neither a Palestinian nor indeed a Jew. Bretschneider, whom Baur practically follows, reckons as errors of this kind (pp. 92–100): (1) That the name of the Pool of Siloam is wrongly translated (ix. 7) "sent" (ἀπεσταλμένος). But similar false etymologies not a few are found in Josephus. (2) The place Bethabara on the other side of Jordan is mistakenly named Bethany (so the Evangelist wrote, at any rate according to the best MSS., ch. i. 28). But why should there not have been, besides the well-known Bethany near Jerusalem, another place similarly named on the other side of Jordan? (3) The place Ænon (iii. 23) it is said is quite unknown and certainly did not exist, for Ænon simply means "water," and was wrongly taken by the Evangelist for the name of a place. One might just as well dispute the existence of most places in the world, for most names of places are originally appellatives. (4) The well-known Shechem, it is said, is called (iv. 5) Sychar in error. But even here an error is improbable, or at least not to be proven. There may easily have been a place Sychar which (on account of the Jacob's well here cited) was situated not far from Shechem.* (5) There is the remark (vii. 52) that out of Galilee no prophet has arisen (perf. ἐγήγερται). This is erroneous, it is said, for Jonah and Nahum both sprang from Galilee. But according to the evidence of the best manuscripts, the Evangelist wrote: "Out of Galilee ariseth (pres. ἐγείρεται) no prophet." (6) Again the Evangelist names Caiaphas "the High Priest for this year" (xi. 49, 51, xviii. 13). This involved a wrong notion that the High Priests changed yearly. Here is really a point for consideration. We know quite certainly that the High Priests did not change yearly, and that Caiaphas in particular was in office ten years at least, if not longer. The above expression appears to rest in fact on the idea that the change was annual, and an error of that kind was the more possible, because in heathen worship—for example in Asia Minor—the High Priesthood was a yearly thing. The opponents of the genuineness of the Gospel lay decisive emphasis on this point at present because they have let other points more or less drop. The defenders seek to show that the Evangelist's manner of expression does not necessarily involve the idea of a yearly change. If their attempts are not quite satisfactory, still this point is not of itself decisive.

Here, as before, the minutiæ do not determine the question. That result must be sought rather in *the general character* of the Gospel. If we compare this with what we know of the Apostle John, two chief peculiarities strike us: (1) *The opposition of the Gospel to Judaism,* and (2) *the Greek philosophical training of the author.* Both are present in such a degree as could scarcely have been anticipated from the Apostle John.

(1) Respecting the attitude of the Apostle John to the Jewish law, we have the authentic testimony of the Apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians. He tells us, in the 2nd chapter, of that celebrated meeting with the original Apostles in Jerusalem about 50–52 A.D., which we commonly call the Apostolic Council. There Paul propounds the question to the first Apostles as to whether it is legitimate and according to the Divine will to convert the heathen to Jesus Christ without laying upon them the observance of the Jewish law. The result of the deliberations is that the first Apostles acknowledged the legitimacy of Paul's work. But this result is only reached by means of the news Paul has to impart, and his mode of representing the matter. *When they saw* that Paul had been intrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, and *when*

---

* The most of modern geographers and exegetes take a place now called *Askar* for the Sychar of the Evangelist.

they perceived the grace which was given to him, they joined hands in fraternal fellowship with him (*cf.* especially verses 7 and 9). They had, therefore, hitherto presupposed the observance of the law on the part of those who believed in Jesus, as something which went without saying. And they wished still to limit themselves (Gal. ii. 9), in their own activity, to the circle of those who observed the law (to "the circumcision"). They acknowledged Paul's work to be legitimate, but on their side they had no desire to take part in it. Indeed, the predominant view, in the circle of the first Apostles, was, even after the deliberations with Paul, that they as born Jews had to observe the law just as before. When Peter, who was decidedly the freest of those in the circle of the first Apostles, ventured to eat in Antioch with heathen Christians, and so to disregard the Jewish laws respecting meats, he was straightway taken to task for it by the Jerusalem Christians, who were in connection with James. And he did not venture to follow his freer conviction, but withdrew to the ground of observance of the law (Gal. ii. 11, 12). Among the chiefs of the Apostolic circle who played the leading part in these questions, Paul mentions besides James and Peter (Cephas), John also (Gal. ii. 9). Whether the latter was more disposed to fraternise with the stricter James or was like the freer Peter we do not know. But even in the latter case, it must be acknowledged that he still observed the law for himself. Peter even did not dare to emancipate himself from it. This holding fast to Jewish custom presupposes a high estimation of it which does not agree with the fundamental thoughts of the Fourth Gospel. To the Evangelist the Jewish law has become something foreign. He knows it only as the law of the Jews (John vii. 19, viii. 17, x. 34, xv. 25). It has according to him absolutely no significance for one who has received the Divine light and life by Jesus Christ, and so has become a child of God. This matter of fact is so clear that one can hardly understand how it could have been recently denied. This, however, has been done in Franke's book, "The Old Testament in John" (1885)—a work exhibiting great industry and care. The author has tried hard to prove that the Evangelist was fundamentally a Jewish Christian and adherent of the law. We must say that the proof does not hold in face of an unprejudiced examination of the facts. The most of the defenders of the genuineness admit, indeed, that between the position which the Apostle John took up at the time of the Apostolic Convention and the standpoint of the Gospel there is a difference. It is held, however, to be possible that the Apostle had passed, in his later years, through a development from the one standpoint to the other; that the change of residence to Ephesus, the removal to a freer environment, had made the Apostle himself freer. This is quite possible in itself. But if the immediate circumstances be considered it can hardly be thought probable. The so-called Apostolic Council falls twenty years after the death of Christ. If during this long time the influence of the preaching of Jesus was not enough to make John a liberal in the then Christian thought, was such a transformation probable at a still later time? At the time of the Apostolic Council John was a man of riper years. Could he have completely emancipated himself from the law after this time when he had not done it at an age at which men according to experience are much more susceptible to psychological changes? The more one is convinced of the opposition between the Fourth Gospel and Jewish Christianity observant of the law, the more difficult is it to maintain the Johannine authorship.

(2) The case stands similarly in reference to the other point—*the Greek philosophical training of the author.* No one can deny that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man of Greek education. He writes much better Greek than, for example, the Apostle Paul, who yet arose out of Tarsus, a seat of Greek learning and culture, and lived his life, for the most part, amid Greek surroundings. He is specially conversant, too, with that Græco-Jewish philosophy, whose chief representative, the Alexandrian Philo, was an older contemporary of Jesus Christ. This Græco-Jewish philosophy was a peculiar blending of Old Testament views of religion with the philosophy of the Greeks. Its view of the world was rooted in Moses and the prophets as much as in Plato and the Stoics. Both streams are here united in one characteristic whole. In these circles the doctrine of the Divine Logos was worked out—a doctrine which the fourth Evangelist, as already shown above, employs, in order to establish and explain theologically the unique dignity of Jesus Christ. The Logos-doctrine is not the only point of contact, however, between the Fourth Gospel and the Græco-Jewish philosophy. The whole world of the Evangelist's thought is much more Hellenistic than (Old Testament) Jewish. The prominent intellectual characteristic which distin-

guishes him comes from the Greek sphere of education. The essence of salvation consists in the knowledge of the truth; through it freedom is attained. Redemption is therefore effected through enlightenment. So Jesus is the Redeemer because He brought the revelation. The Evangelist holds this fundamental view in common with the Gnostics and the Apologists of the second century. It grew up, however, on Greek ground. The opponents of the authenticity of our Gospel lay decisive emphasis on this point. They say that, from all we know of the Apostle John, we could not anticipate such a degree of Greek training, indeed any Greek training at all. He was a Palestinian, son of a fisherman from the Lake of Gennesaret, a man destitute of the learning of the schools. Peter and he are described in the Acts of the Apostles as "unlearned and ignorant men" (Acts iv. 13). If he knew Greek at all, this could only be in a poor degree. His native tongue was the tongue of Palestine—Aramaic. How could such a man have written our Gospel, which presupposes a high degree of Greek learning? The defenders have taken up a difficult position against this argument. They seek to minimise, first of all, as far as possible the extent of the Greek training of our author. Many passages they quite disregard, and they dispute every connection with the Jewish philosophy of Alexandria. The Evangelist's Logos-doctrine they say arose simply on Old Testament ground, and has nothing to do with the Logos-doctrine of Philo. These assertions cannot be thoroughly maintained in face of the facts. Many defenders admit a certain measure of Hellenistic learning, and some connection with the doctrine of Philo; but they think the Apostle could have appropriated all this during his later stay in Ephesus amid Greek environment. The question is similar here, therefore, to that in relation to the anti-Jewish standpoint. Is it probable that the Apostle John made such a change in his later years? The greater the amount of Hellenistic culture which we feel it necessary to admit in the Evangelist, the more difficult is it to suppose such a change.

We have now exhausted the chief questions which arise from the character of our Gospel as related to the Synoptics, and in relation to the person of the Apostle John.

Baur's school regarded the Gospel's *relation to the Apocalypse* as important for our question. It was acknowledged as certain that the Gospel could not be by the same author as the Revelation. This, in fact, may be admitted on account of the great difference between them. But while the school of Schleiermacher deduced from this that the Apocalypse could not be by the Apostle, Baur's school argued in the reverse way. The latter hold that the Jewish-Christian standpoint of the Revelation corresponds exactly with what we might anticipate from the Apostle, and that there is far stronger external testimony for the Johannine authorship here than in the case of the Gospel. There is the testimony of Justin Martyr, who, Baur thinks, did not know the Gospel at all. Hence it is concluded that the Gospel cannot have been written by the Apostle. It is now no longer necessary to discuss this more fully, for the authenticity of the Apocalypse itself is strongly contested in recent times. The discussions on the subject are still in full swing, so that it cannot be decided in which direction the consensus of critics will turn. But just because there is doubt no one can at present derive a decisive argument against the Apostolic origin of the Gospel from the character of the Apocalypse.

There is still another point on which Baur's school laid considerable emphasis, but which at present has moved somewhat into the background—the relation, namely, of the Apostle John to *the celebration of Easter in Asia Minor.* In the Church of Asia Minor in the second century the Christian Easter was always celebrated at the Jewish date, the 14th of Nisan. When discussion arose, during the last decades of the second century, with the Western Church, the Christians of Asia Minor defended their custom by appealing to the Last Supper. This original celebration had, they said, taken place on the day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th of Nisan. The Christians of Asia Minor followed, therefore, the chronology of the Passion found in the Synoptics. They at once appeal, however, to the example of the Apostle John, who, whilst he stayed in Ephesus, had observed that custom. Since that time the whole Church of Asia Minor had followed him. Baur's school deduced from this, as Bretschneider had done, that even the Apostle John followed the Synoptic chronology, and that consequently the Fourth Gospel, with a different chronology, could not have been written by him. This apparently very conclusive argument has a flaw, however. We do not know from what point of view the celebration of the feast in Asia Minor first originated. At the time of the controversy the Christians of Asia Minor certainly defended their custom by using the Synoptic chronology. It cannot be proved, however, that the latter was the standard for the feast from the first. It is much more probable that the Jewish date, 14th Nisan, was simply retained when the Jewish was changed into a Christian celebration. Instead of the Jewish Feast of Redemption the Christian feast was observed. The chronological question as to whether Jesus had, on the day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th Nisan, held a meal with His disciples, and been crucified on the day following, or whether both events came a day earlier, could hardly have been under consideration. If this be so, then the Apostle John's participation in the celebration in Asia Minor is of no importance for the question as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

All our observations, so far, have been based on the content and structure of the Gospel itself. We have presented them at comparative length, because the internal grounds will in the end be decisive in our great controversy. If we have rightly appraised them, they are in the highest degree unfavourable to the acceptance of the Apostolic origin of our Gospel. Under the feeling that this is actually the case, many defenders lay all the greater emphasis on *the external evidence.* The latter is so strong, they think, that it compels us to accept the Apostolic origin, and to count all other points secondary. In England, at any rate, the majority vote would still be on the side of the defenders.* Is that view actually well founded? Emphasis is laid on all modern discoveries and thorough investigations having been favourable to the Gospel. Since the conclusion of the Clementine Homilies and the Diatessaron of Tatian were discovered, it is thought no further doubt could be entertained as to John's Gospel having been used in these writings. Minute investigation of Justin also had proved that even he had known our Gospel. Finally, the Gnostic fragments which had come to light through the discovery of the Philosophumena of Hippolytus had shown that Basilides and Valentinus had also used the Gospel. But what does all this amount to? The date of the rise of the Clementine Homilies is quite unknown. Tatian was a disciple of Justin; but Justin wrote about 140–150 A.D. Whether the fragments of the Gnostics, which are given in the Philosophumena, came from Basilides and Valentinus themselves is very uncertain. Probably the writings referred to are later productions of the school of Basilides and Valentinus. So there only remains further, the fact that Justin knew our Gospel. Observe it is said "knew," for he never quoted it. We cannot say, therefore, whether he regarded it as a work by the Apostle John. All this evidence, then, does not amount to anything over against the weight of internal testimony. The only external evidence that is of any importance is that of Irenæus, and at the present the most emphasis is laid on that in Germany. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, about 180–190 A.D., takes for granted that the composition of the Fourth Gospel by the Apostle John is undoubted and acknowledged. But it is held there is a direct chain of tradition from Irenæus back to the Apostle John himself. In a fragment, preserved for us by the Church History of Eusebius (v. 20), Irenæus tells us that he, when a boy, had seen and heard Polycarp in Asia Minor, as Polycarp spoke of his intercourse with the Apostle John. "I can still tell the place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit and talk; his going out and coming in, and his manner of life; the look of him and his addresses which he gave to the people; and *how he narrated his intercourse with John* and the others who had seen the Lord, and what he thought of their words, &c." Although John is not expressly described here as the Apostle there can be no doubt Irenæus meant the Apostle, or otherwise he would have added a more particular description of this John in some way. True, several modern critics, especially Keim, have held that Irenæus was guilty of confusion. Polycarp, they say, was not speaking of the Apostle John, but of another John—the so-called Presbyter of whom we know through Papias. What Irenæus had heard as a youth about the latter John from the mouth of Polycarp he had wrongly applied to the Apostle in his later recollection. Such a confusion is possible, but there is scarcely sufficient ground for its acceptance. It is therefore admitted that Irenæus had really heard Polycarp tell of John. But we do not learn anything of what he heard him relate. Nothing is said of the Gospel of John in this connection at all. There is therefore no kind of decisive evidence here. Those recollections of Irenæus about something which he had heard in his childhood from the mouth of Polycarp respecting John, and the use of the Fourth Gospel by Irenæus as a work of John, are two matters which stand in no necessary connection with one another. The first fact is no security to us that he possessed any authentic information respecting the second. There is here, then, a mere possibility. But over against this possibility, the opponents of the genuineness draw attention to certain critical points in the series of external evidences. (1) Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis, wrote, in the first half of the second century (the date cannot be exactly given), "An Elucidation of the Sayings of the Lord." The work itself is lost. Eusebius has, however, preserved for us in his Church History a large piece from the preface, in which Papias, among other things, tells what he had learned by verbal inquiries respecting the literary activity of Mark and Matthew. Mark had recorded the sayings and doings of Christ so far as he remembered them from Peter's accounts, but Matthew had recorded the sayings of the Lord in the Hebrew tongue. Since Eusebius drew special attention to this kind of information respecting the rise of the New Testament Scriptures, it is probable that he did not find any more of it in the work of Papias. If Papias only spoke of Gospel writings by Mark and Matthew, however, could he have known of the Fourth Gospel as a work of the Apostle John? Was it not to be expected that in this case he would have expressed himself also respecting the Gospel of John? Many think that probability demands that this question be answered in the affirmative. And the higher the authority of Papias is set the more suspicious is his silence respecting our Gospel. The assurance of Eusebius that Papias had used the First Epistle of John does not counterbalance this, for the use of it is no proof that he held it to be Johannine. It has not been proved, too, that the Epistle and Gospel were acknowledged to be by the same author.* (2) Justin Martyr's acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel is, as a rule, admitted by modern critics. They at once, however, lay emphasis on his manner of using it as being rather unfavourable than favourable to the acceptance of the Apostolic origin. Whilst almost all that Justin quotes of the sayings of the Lord and the facts of Gospel history is taken from the Synoptics, he only betrays an acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel in isolated passages. Evidently the Gospel history was then current in the Synoptic form, but not in the Johannine. The Synoptics were in use in the Church, having become established long before. The Fourth Gospel, however, had newly appeared, and it is doubtful whether Justin regarded it as apostolic. It is a fact that Justin makes remarkably sparing, indeed, almost no use, of the Fourth Gospel as a source of history. And we may readily conclude, therefore, that the fact is to be explained as already suggested. (3) But we know further, through Irenæus and Epiphanius, that there was a party in the Church in the second century which did not acknowledge the Gospel of John as Apostolic or Canonical (Iren. iii. 11, 9: Illam speciem non admittunt, quæ est secundum Johannis Evangelium). Because they rejected the Logos-Gospel Epiphanius calls them, mockingly, the "*Alogoi*"—that is, "devoid of reason." These opponents of the Gospel of John were not heretics, but a party in the Church.* How could such a party venture to reject the Gospel if its Apostolic origin was known and acknowledged? They had dogmatic grounds, to be sure, for the rejection. But after the Apostolic origin of the New Testament Scriptures was once acknowledged by the Church, parties set on one side the strongest dogmatic points which were not convenient to them, in quite another way—not by rejection, but by interpretation of Scripture. If the Alogoi had recourse simply to rejecting the Gospel, its Apostolic origin cannot at that time have been generally acknowledged.

---

* *Cf. e.g.*, Gloag, "Introduction to the Johannine Writings" (1891), p. 127; and Sanday's declaration in his Inaugural Address on the Study of the New Testament, delivered before the University of Oxford in 1883 (quoted by Gloag, p. ix. of Preface).

These arguments are well suited to diminish our trust in the "external evidence." The most one can admit in an unprejudiced way is that the external evidence is evenly balanced *pro* and *con*, and leads to no decision. Perhaps, however, it is truer to say, it is more unfavourable than favourable to the authenticity.

But to one chief point of the defenders we have not yet referred, namely, *the Gospel's own statements* concerning its writer. It is said that the Gospel professes to be from the hand of an eye-witness—the Apostle John. It is written in the prologue, "We beheld His glory" (i. 14), and when the fact is recorded that blood and water flowed from Jesus' side when pierced, the author assures us that he saw this himself (xix. 35). Since he, however, never mentions the Apostle John, but merely states that an unnamed person enjoyed in an un-exceptional degree the love of the master, he indicates, it is thought, in a sensitive and reticent way that he is himself the unnamed person. So it is held that the author intends he should himself be taken for the Apostle John. So noble and sensitive a soul, however, would deserve to be believed. Finally, his own testimony is strengthened by another piece of added evidence, that the beloved disciple had written the Gospel (John xxi. 24). The opponents of the authenticity judge quite differently respecting these points also. The closing note (xxi. 24), just because added by a later hand, is in no way decisive. The Gospel itself, too, does not anywhere pretend to be a work of the Apostle John. For that "we" of the prologue simply means "we men on earth." The author is speaking there in the name of humanity, not in the name of the "personal disciples of Jesus." In the account of the piercing of Jesus' side also, the author expressly distinguishes himself from the person who guarantees the fact. "He that saw it bare record and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true" (xix. 35). That does not sound as if the author meant himself to be regarded as an eye-witness. Finally, the way in which the beloved disciple is spoken of, can only be regarded as sensitive and refined, if the author is not himself this beloved disciple. These latter explanations can scarcely be thought wrong, if an unprejudiced judgment be given.

---

* *Cf.* here especially, Harnack's Article "The Monarchians" in Herzog's "Real-Encyclopädie."

* It is hardly worth while citing an alleged positive testimony of Papias for our Gospel, which some modern apologists have adduced. In some Latin MSS. of the Bible belonging to the Middle Ages a prologue is inserted at the beginning of our Gospel, in which it is recorded that Papias reported the Fourth Gospel to be by John. (Evangelium Johannis manifestatum et datum ecclesiis ab Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut Papias nomine Hicrapolitanus discipulus Johannis carus . . . . retulit.) The author of this prologue proves himself, by other foolish assertions, so ignorant that his statements deserve no credence.

Unmistakably then, the conscientious labour of theological science has strengthened the suspicion against the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and the number is constantly increasing of those who believe it in the highest degree improbable that the Apostle wrote the Gospel. But one thing may, in conclusion, be emphasised. Even if Protestant Theology should become convinced that this Gospel was not written by an Apostle, the peculiar worth of it will still remain. For its worth lies not in its historical narrative, but in its doctrine or teaching. On that point opponents as well as defenders of the genuineness are at one. What is the fundamental thought it presents? Not philosophical speculations. These are only aids to the author. Rather is it a cardinal point of our Christian faith which is presented—the conviction that in the person of Jesus Christ God revealed Himself. Jesus Christ —and He alone—by His perfect union with His heavenly Father gave Divine light and life perfectly to men. Only he who comes to Jesus will find life and full satisfaction (x. 10). That is the fundamental thought of our Gospel. That is, however, a fundamental point also of our Christian faith. And nowhere in the New Testament is it expressed with such clearness and distinctness, with such ardour and fulness of faith, with such victorious confidence as in our Gospel. Therefore, even if this Gospel must fall more and more behind the Synoptics as a source of history, it will always have its worth as a witness of the Christian faith.

THE RELIGIOUS USES OF HARDSHIP.

BY JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., MINISTER OF THE CITY TEMPLE, LONDON.

From *The Young Man* (London), September, 1891.

"And they were to prove Israel by them."—*Jud.* iii. 4.

In the previous chapter the Lord says, "I also will not henceforth drive out any from before them of the nations that Joshua left when he died: that through them I may prove Israel." The Lord did not drive out the nations hastily; He kept the heathen to be the schoolmasters of Israel; He kept the heathen to be the tormentors of His people—thorns and goads by which their temper and their general quality might be tested. The enemies did not know what they were doing. The enemy took a short view of the whole situation. He was but a warrior; he was but contending for his own freehold; he was but a patriot, according to his own conception of patriotism; he insisted upon keeping his own foot upon his own ground; so, whether men were good, bad, or indifferent, he would have none of them in his land. That is the Pagan view of life. The Divine view is that the Pagan is kept in order to teach the man who ought to be no Pagan, but a real, simple-hearted, honest believer in God. The Pagan was a rod in the hands of the living God. Israel took a fretful view of the circumstance; Israel repined and moaned, and was chafed in spirit. He did not know all the case. What man amongst us knows what the Lord is doing with him and for him? The spring is hidden in the clouds which darken the heavens; presently it will come down upon us in the form of rain, then we shall begin to see why the clouds were darkening the sky. Do you know what your enemies live for? They live to keep you right. Do you know why the thorns grow? That you may be pricked, to teach you good manners, excellent behaviour, careful, circumspect conduct. All things are for your sakes. Why are the rocks in the ground so that the plough cannot make a straight furrow? For your education. Why can I not have everything my own way? Because it would be bad for me if I could. Why so many opponents, enemies, antagonists, rivals? Simply that I may be educated to the highest point of refinement, and be presented at the last a perfect man in Christ Jesus, the old Adam dead, the new man fashioned in the figure, and beautiful with the loveliness of the second Adam. That is all. Why did not the Lord drive out all these nations? Why the "five lords of the Philistines, and the Canaanites, and the Sidonians, and the Hivites that dwell in Mount Lebanon?" Why all the Pagan host? Simply, I repeat, to keep Israel right. We must not have too much heaven upon the earth. We need all the rocks and all the thorns, and all the east winds that ever blew. We think not; we think we could live better in the south-west wind, and do better without the stony places in the field; we think all men should be our friends. But what right have we to think, beyond a given point, so near, so small? When we have exercised our right of thinking up to the prescribed point, we shall say, We stop here; we thought it would have been otherwise, but God's good will be done. You are not to fight for fighting's sake; you are not to fight that you may win; you are to fight that you may be educated; contention should mean elevation, refinement, self-restraint, godliness. All controversy is from below that does not help a man when the storm has gone to praise God more profoundly and sing more lovingly.

What the Lord did in the case of Israel He is doing in our case every day. Look what hardships are yours. Nothing goes right five days in the week. You put things down expecting to find them where you left them, and when you return, they have all disappeared, and not a soul knows where they have been taken to. It is for your sake. You were going to make too much of them; you were going to write down that lead was iron, and iron was silver, and silver was gold; you were reckoning along the wrong line altogether, so God came and took away all that you had left, and your fortune became emptiness. You can take one of two views of such instances. You can say, This is mishap, this is accident, this is chance; it has so fallen out; I cannot account for it. Or you can say, Behind all this difficulty and loss and hardship there is a meaning. The Lord reigneth. The sparrows He watches; the hairs upon the head He counts; the steps of the good man He orders; therefore behind all this prostration of purpose and adaptation there must be some good reason. What is it? Where you cannot explain, you can pray; where you cannot illuminate the mystery, you can sit still or stand still and quietly wait. You can search your heart as with the candle of the Lord. In that heart you will find all the reason if you really want to find it. There is the case of the prodigal. Why should my son, say you, be the plague of my life? He is breaking my heart, breaking his mother's heart, turning our bread into bitterness. What is the meaning of this? Surely I am not to blame! You are more, perhaps, than you think. That son may be in some respects keeping you right, educating you, teaching you how to pray. You have been very rough with other people's sons; you could see them damned and never shed a tear. The only way in which God can get at you is through that boy of yours. When you prayed aforetime, your prayers were so stiff and hard. Not a tear in all the supplication—nothing but Pharisaic pomp and artificiality; but since your own heart has been grieved with a deeper grief, you have been taught how to pray. Now men love to hear you speak of heaven: the tone is so rich, so kind, so hopeful. You can take one of two views even of the prodigal. You can stand up and say, I have done no wrong; I cannot be held responsible for this evil conduct; I have taken the right course; I have done my duty. If ever you hear a man talk too much about having done his duty, he cannot see the kingdom of God. *You* done your duty! Why, you are claiming to be almost a god. Or you can say, I must have been wrong, perhaps, without knowing it altogether, perhaps in a larger degree than I have ever suspected; let me recall my life, and settle accounts with my own conscience. God may be thus training both of us. God will not take a prodigal and make educative use of him, and then throw him away. I cannot think that God can so use the meanest of His creatures. To use him as an opponent that will bring you to prayer may itself be the beginning of a noble issue in his own case. I have seen a thousand prodigals come home; I have never known a Pharisee saved. Far be it from me to say that no Pharisee has been broken down and received into the kingdom of God. I trust thousands have. I am only speaking within the limits of my own personal observation. By Pharisee I do not refer to office—I refer to character, and by character in this case I mean self-righteousness, self-idolatry, self-sufficiency. The self-sufficient man never can be saved. To whom then will God look, and upon whom will He show mercy? To the broken in heart and the contrite, and to those who surrender themselves to Him, saying, "God be merciful unto me a sinner!" The dew will fall upon him, and the anointing oil, and the enlightening sun of the glory, and all heaven will open for him. If we would be saved, it must be along such lines. We must accept providence as having meaning. To believe in providence, and to trust to chance, is the direst atheism. Your providence must not be in your creed,—it must be in your soul; you must live upon it as upon daily bread.

God must be left to determine what tests are best for each man. What would be tests in one case might be no tests in another. The distribution of tests, therefore, must be left to the Most High and the All Good. Some men must be tried through business. Business is now fast becoming a game, and not a game of skill. You are opposed on every hand. Business has now become a bloodless war. We fight with swords other than swords of steel. Every business man is exposed to the peril of becoming a warrior, and having his own brother as his antagonist. Some men cannot succeed in business. Whilst they are servants, they do fairly well; the moment they become masters, they make fools of themselves. They have not intellectual captaincy; they have no commercial capacity; they see a point, not a line; they are intense, not extensive, and therefore they have their little ups and downs which they call their fortunes and their misfortunes; but they never grip life and hold it, and master it, and defy it. Is this a mere matter of chance? God tries men in various ways. Some men would be damned if they could double their business. They do not think so; they would not believe the audacious preacher who would teach such a doctrine; but that is the fact. They will only be saved by being kept under given restraints. God knows exactly every shilling I can be trusted with: if with twenty, I have not twenty-one. I think I could do so much with the extra shilling, and God will not give it to me, and He will tell me in heaven why it was that my income was a pound and not a guinea. I live now in God; the pound will go further than the guinea if I accept it in the right way; the Lord knows that I cannot be trusted beyond a given tether. Let my heart leap up and say, "Father, fix the tether, and give me all the ground that is good for me, and may I make every inch of it praying ground."

Other men can only be tried and tested through the body. You must have that rheum, that sharp pain, that disabling agony. It is through the body that God finds the highway to your soul. He found the soul of the other man along the line of business. You have never had any trouble in that direction. You could lose, and not know it; you could gain, and be none the richer. Through your body, therefore, God must find that recreant soul of yours. Take this view of your pain, your sleeplessness, your aching head, your general disability. Who knows but that God has left these hordes of the Philistines, and the Canaanites, and the Sidonians, and the Hivites—left them in your blood to make a man of you? You know how harsh you used to be. When your own apprentice fell ill, you treated him with suspicion and disbelief, and told him to get up and do his work if he would receive his rations. How now? Will you get up? Bestir yourself! The pain lies along the whole length of the sciatic nerve. Get up! You will be gentler now, kindlier; you will find your way to your purse when you see some fellow-cripple in greater pecuniary need than you are.

Some men are tried by rivalry. Their rivals will not die. You have said, Surely in another five years that man will be dead and gone, whereas in another five years he is younger than ever. How is this? You can take two views of it—one the atheistic, the other the theistic or providential. That man may be keeping you up to the mark. The cobwebs would be covering your business windows if he were not up earlier than you are, brightening his panes of glass. You owe that man a great deal; you would have taken things very easily if he had not been there; you have called him a kind of enemy—in reality he has been much of a friend.

Others are tried by long waiting. Patience is almost murdered in the soul. The letter of release will come to-morrow, and to-morrow comes, but no letter. The heart that is hard towards you will be softened by its sunset, and then you will be relieved and blessed. Sunset comes, but no softening of the heart. It is now seven years you have been waiting for that particular event; you have almost calculated the hour of its consummation. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." You have almost given up. Blessed be God that "almost" stands between you and despair. Hold to it; you may yet be educated, refined, brought to loyalty, to obedience, and to prayer.

Thus we are brought back to consider the religious uses of hardship. Some of us have had so much difficulty. We have not one crumb of bread we have not fought for. Everything in the house we have taken at the spear-point. Some men seem to carry the hardships of ten lives. Will the severe hand never be taken off the bending neck? Will the yoke never be eased? Is it to be one continual goad and chafe down to the very end? How much of the blame is ours? Why do we not surrender, give in, and say, Galilean, Thou hast conquered; God of the worlds, Thou art mightier than I am; take my heart; it is broken, but Thou canst live in the crumbling fragments. All that is wanted on our part is obedience to the infinite, the everlasting, the supreme, final Necessity. We prefer to substitute the grand evangelical terms, and say, The will of God, the redeeming sovereignty of Christ, the presence and rule, the inspiration and sustenance of God the Holy Ghost. Yet take which set of terms you please; begin your higher education where you like; only do begin it. I would rather you worship a stone in the streets, than that you never worship at all. Reverence is elevating, veneration is the bloom of character. It is customary for men who laugh too easily—and therefore their laughter costs them nothing and is worth nothing—to regard with comic feeling the idea of some poor savage falling down before a tree or star, or some little flower in the ground. They laugh the more when the poor savage worships some rude beast of the forest, and they laugh the more loudly when they are told that in some countries heathen men sell their gods for gold. That is what we are doing in all the thoroughfares of London every day in the week. The form is not so; but what of the spirit, what of the intent, what of the purpose of the heart? The man who is silent when he ought to speak for justice has sold what god he had. The man who will not encounter inconvenience and undergo sacrifice that he may proclaim the Christ to whom he nominally trusts, has sold that Christ, and is a baser Iscariot than Judas. It is easy to laugh at the heathen, to smile at the idea of their parting with their gods. We have sold God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost nearly every day of our conscious and responsible life. When we lied—do you remember? When we told half the truth—you know the time. When we oppressed the weak—you can never forget the look of that man as he went down under your cruel pressure; you will see his eyes on your dying day. It was then we sold the Trinity we sang to on the Sabbath preceding.

Our hardships may become our blessings if we accept them in a religious spirit. I have to thank God for every hardship I have undergone. They were terrible at the time; they have been in some degree sanctified; sometimes I can now pray; in some moments I can wrestle with God and throw Him by His kind consent. Sometimes, indeed, I have wrestled with Him at daybreak, and although He has left His mark upon me, He has left His blessing in me, giving me larger name and larger power. I would undertake to say that if any man has accepted his hardships in the right spirit, he is the better for them—not always will the word "better" be defined in the same way, but in some way—in taking certain elements out of his disposition, in putting certain other elements into his disposition, by rebuking his ambitions, by chastening his presumption, by leading him to see that things are larger than he supposed them to be, and especially by making him quiet where once he was riotous in declamation. Never remark on any other man's hardships so as to increase them. If you cannot relieve a man's burdens, do not add to them. Do not remind him of things that will only depress his spirit. If you see a poor cripple on the road, do not laugh at his infirmity; it is enough for him to bear it without having added to it your neglect, contumely, and insult. If a man is poor, do not shake your purse in his eyes, unless you mean to share it with him, and even then the shaking may be done without. "The heart knoweth its own bitterness." You have your difficulties in business, at home, in the body, in commercial or scholastic rivalry and emulation; you have your difficulties of temper, and you know that many a time when you think you are going to smite and overthrow, you do but bruise your poor knuckles on the unyielding rock. All men have their hardships; all men have their difficulties. Let us accept them in the right spirit; let us make as few difficulties as we can between one another, and when God uses us providentially for conflict and antagonism, let us believe that in the end the explanation will come like a rising light. Life is a plan, life is a school, life is a preparation. We are made by our enemies. Many of us could say, I should have failed through indolence if I had not been pricked and goaded by some rival—by some rival whom I hated at the time. One day that rival and I shall shake hands and say it was all right, though we knew it not.

Thus would I accept life. Jesus Christ would not have redeemed it with blood if it had been a thing superficial. The Christ would have been the gigantic mistake of eternity if life were a mere game of chance. If I would know what my life is and what it is worth, I will not consult some intellectual calculator to tell me the price in figures, I will look at the Christ of Christ and see in that Christ what every man is worth. If I get the right view, I will say I am not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, which could buy kings and thrones, crowns and palaces, but with the precious, the pricely blood of Christ. In that word "blood" find no coarseness, find life, agony, all.

JOHN MASON NEALE, D.D.

BY REV. GEORGE HUNTINGTON, M.A.

From *The Newberry House Magazine* (London), September, 1891.

In recalling the memory of this great scholar and divine, I wish it to be understood that I am drawing on my own recollections as well as on those of mutual friends. I am also indebted to the interesting memoir placed in my hands by the Sister who edits *S. Margaret's Magazine*, and to an obituary notice by a brother poet and hymnologist, the Rev. Gerald Moultrie.* No one indeed could know Dr. Neale by mere hearsay. To know him you must have seen him at East Grinstead, as to know Keble you must have seen him at Hursley. The two were much alike in their reserve, and dislike of notoriety. But Neale was at times so abstracted and absorbed that it was no easy matter to draw him out. Stories are told of people who made pilgrimages to the picturesque and quaint old college to interview him, as the Yankees say, and who went back with hardly the interchange of a word. But when visitors properly accredited came, they found him a man of infinite resources.

"Hither came scholars and the letters of scholars, from far and near, Oxford and Cambridge, London and Dublin, Russia and America, propounding knotty points for elucidation in theology, politics, hymnology, liturgiology, canon law, and history. And the Warden, master of some twenty languages, and of an immense mass of varied learning, the first liturgical scholar of his day, and endowed with foresight, amounting (as subsequent events have proved) almost to prophecy, writes there standing behind his desk, shy, retiring, assuming nothing but his own inadequacy to instruct, and yet ready with a satisfactory answer to almost every question. Besides replies to these individual applications, his unresisting pen pours forth work upon work with marvellous rapidity, learning, and versatility, church history, theological essays, children's hymns and stories, and catechisings, newspaper articles, Seatonian prize poems, translations into or out of Greek and Latin, pamphlets on questions of the day, Scripture commentaries and historical tales, biographies, cantilenæ in dog-Latin, travels and sermons. And Sackville College was itself no unsuitable home for such a man. Quiet, withdrawn from the stir and bustle of ordinary life, it was well fitted for the abode of a scholar. . . . As he laboured for his College, and in its little chapel, so much more did he labour for England and its Church, not rightly appreciated at the time. But over his study-door was the inscription, 'Through evil report and good report,' and over his mantelpiece, 'Per angusta ad augusta.'"

Really to know what manner of man he was he had to be seen greeting the aged inmates, and speaking to them in their chapel those inimitable addresses afterwards known as "Readings for the Aged;" or in the convent, where he ruled the Sisters by gentle and yet wise and firm discipline; or in S. Agnes' School, where he varied his religious teaching with stories from history and tales of Christian heroism; or in the orphanage, where the little ones clustered around their "dear Father," as they always called him. In the very Oratory itself he used to have a child on each side of him putting up its tiny hands to touch his, or to finger his robes. Of no one could Goldsmith's lines be more truly said:

"E'en children followed with endearing wile,
And pluck'd his gown to share the good man's smile."

His love of animals was quite as marked.

---

* Reprinted from the *Churchman's Companion*, 1866. Signed, G. M.

Not a boy would beat a donkey, or throw a stone at a dog, if he were suspected to be near. One day some urchins were belabouring a donkey, when, just as they turned the corner, there was Dr. Neale. "Dear boys," said he, "do you know who used to ride on an ass?" "Yes, sir," replied the boys, plucking their forelocks, "Jesus Christ." "Well then, think of that, and let it keep you from being cruel; and see there—ah! it is nearly worn away by this collar—He marked the ass with His cross"—alluding to its mane. "Now, promise me, my laddies, that you'll never ill-treat your donkey again." The boys kept their word, and the good Warden never passed them without a kind word or a penny. Sometimes he walked by the cart with his hand on the animal's shoulder, and sometimes he used to call to drivers as they passed the College Green to stop that he might give their asses carrots. The Cheshire farmers will never forget their finding him, when on a visit to Tarporley Rectory during the cattle plague, on his knees in the cow-houses praying for the suffering animals.* After this they regularly sent for him to do so.

He was one of the most generous men that ever lived, and, like Dr. Hook, could never keep a penny in his pocket. His good wife tried to teach him common prudence by giving him a certain sum to expend every day; but it was quite useless. He gave to all who asked, and was very often beset by beggars who knew his habits, and who waylaid him as he walked from the College to the Convent. I was walking with him to the railway-station when a beggar accosted him on whom he bestowed the only coin he had with him, a shilling to pay his fare with. The stationmaster guessed what had happened, and handed him his ticket with a smile. I expostulated: "Neale, I'm sure that fellow is an impostor." "That rests with God" was all he said in reply.

He took the precept literally, "Give to him that asketh of thee, and never turn thy face from any poor man." Neither Mrs. Neale nor his servants were at liberty to break through the rule of giving, if only a penny or a slice of bread, to every applicant. Certainly he had no faith in "political economy."

"His charity knew no distinction of creeds. There were always some poor people invited, out of the town, to the Sunday dinners, until there were inmates enough in the College to fill up the tables. Their only claim to admission was their poverty. It was never asked whether they went to Little Bethel or the Parish Church. Aged, sick, infirm, Churchmen or Dissenters, all found a welcome at his board, and sympathy from that loving heart."

"Amongst the earliest recipients of his aid was an Independent minister in declining health, who was said to have been worried out of six of his seven senses by his people, because mentally he was too independent—a condition of mind which is not approved of by the Independents. He seems to have been a man of high and elevated character. He was often visited by Dr. Neale, and on leaving East Grinstead one of Dr. Neale's relations at his request supplied him with delicacies for his fading and consumptive body, and with books and cheerful attention to smooth his pathway to the tomb. Another Dissenting minister —a Presbyterian—became a warm admirer of Dr. Neale. He used to resort to Dr. Neale for the loan of books, and for conversation on topics of interest. He was taken ill, and experienced the hospitality of the College. This man had the courage to stand forth as a defender of Dr. Neale in a Dissenting paper in 1857 (a time of great excitement), when he ably reviewed Dr. Neale's works."

That Dr. Neale was slovenly in his personal appearance, and that when a new suit of clothes became an absolute necessity they had to be placed on a chair for him to put on unwitting of their novelty, most of his intimates were aware.

His friend G. M. says: "He was singularly careless of his own personal comfort, going about without umbrella and in his thin cassock, in all weathers. Last winter (his last), however, to the great surprise of the sisterhood he came out with a pair of overshoes to walk down to the new buildings in. It was his favourite walk, as it was the dear wish of his life to see his beloved Sisters and orphans comfortably housed—a wish, alas! not destined to be accomplished. He said that his feet were often wet through three times a day. This seemed quite sufficient reason, but it quietly transpired that the chief thing in his mind was that it gave the servants so much trouble."

How he got through so much literary work was a mystery to people who did not know his ways, and the little time he took for rest. Who that was ever inside it will forget that wonderful library, his book-room as he called it? It was quaint in its architecture and quaint in its fittings, piled up from floor to roof with folios, quartos, octavos, in all kinds of bindings, and all kinds of languages, and strewed with pamphlets, papers, and manuscripts, "in sweet confusion blended." It was a "chaos" worse than Bishop Thirlwall's at Abergwili Palace, of which his lordship wrote to a lady friend, who offered to put it into order for him: "As it is, it is difficult to me to find my papers, but if *you* were to attempt to reduce chaos to order it would be impossible." Here, in this study of his, the learned Warden sat, or rather stood at his desk, or walked up and down, dictating to the sister who acted as his amanuensis, whom he had taught to write in Greek and German, and I am not sure if not also in Hebrew and Syriac characters.[*] Here he read on, whilst the peacocks were uttering their sharp screams under his window, looking out for bits of bread to be thrown to them. Here, too, long after the aged pensioners were snoring in their dormitories, he remained till he took his nightly rounds in the quadrangle before retiring for some four hours' sleep. He used to take his friends out to hear them snore. I shall not forget the sounds. But it was when he could be coaxed away from his beloved books that you saw him at his best. Then, if you knew how to draw him out—not always easy—you found him a most genial companion; he would sit up with you to the "sma' hours," telling endless stories and legends, diving into old books and manuscripts, giving you bits of classical, ecclesiastical, or ecclesiological lore, and, if the truth must be told, setting your hair on end by ghost stories, in which he firmly believed. My friend H. D. N. once sat up with him till two o'clock in the morning, when they parted to go to their bed-rooms, but no sooner had the guest fallen into his first sleep than he was awakened by the sound of footsteps approaching, and a dim light drawing nearer and nearer; the door opened, and an apparition was seen, none other than Dr. Neale in his cassock, and a lantern in his hand. He had clean forgotten that he had given up his own bed-room to his friend, and taken another. Of course the absent-minded host was profuse in his apologies, but I believe that he enjoyed his friend's discomfiture. "I'm afraid," said he, "you took me for a ghost." "To tell you the truth, I did," was the reply. But no sooner was the nocturnal visitor's back turned than the guest got out of bed, and firmly bolted his door. Dr. Neale and the late Bishop Wilberforce have been known to sit up the night through telling each other stories of the supernatural. One or two of these are extant. My intimacy with Dr. Neale began by my placing one of my then little daughters at S. Agnes' School, under the Sisters. At that time he looked very much like his portraits. He was a tall, angular, rather loosely limbed man, dressed in the old-fashioned way that Pusey and Keble, and Isaac Williams used to dress, in swallow-tailed coats, tall hats, and white ties. He was sallow in complexion, with dark and not very tidily brushed hair, short-sighted, wore spectacles, and had a distraught and dreamy look, as though his thoughts were far away. His head was intellectual, and when a smile crossed his somewhat melancholic aspect, it animated his entire features, like a sunbeam on a winter's day. Within the College precincts, and at the Sisterhood, he always dressed in his cassock with a trencher cap on his head, and a pair of bands under his chin. Amongst his many accomplishments was that of Latin writing. I once put him to the test by dictating a paragraph out of the *Times* newspaper; he rendered it in that learned tongue as readily as a schoolboy would a dictation lesson. He used to use up odds and ends of time, when waiting for a train, thereby sometimes missing it, or when awaiting the arrival of a hostess, by noting down on backs of envelopes or bits of waste paper any thought that occurred to him. This came out in rather a notable way on a visit he paid to Hursley, whither he had been invited by Mr. Keble with the Bishop of Salisbury to help them with a new hymnal. Mr. Keble used to be fond of telling the story, but I had it from Dr. Neale himself. As told me, Neale arrived a few minutes before his host, who was busy in his parish. On his return Dr. Neale said, "Why, Keble, I thought you told me that the 'Christian Year' was entirely original?" "Yes," he answered, "it certainly is." "Then how comes this?" And Dr. Neale placed before him the Latin of one of Keble's hymns for a Saint's Day (S. Luke's). Keble was utterly confounded. There was the English which he knew that he had made, and there too, no less certainly, was the Latin, with far too unpleasant a resemblance to his own to be fortuitous. He protested that he had never seen this original, no not in all his life, etc. etc. After a few minutes more Neale relieved him by owning that he had just turned it into Latin in his absence.

---

* On this occasion he wrote his hymn, "All Creation groans and travails."

---

[*] This habit of his of walking up and down while he thought and dictated his thoughts was inveterate. As I sat in the library reading the *Guardian*, he came to a standstill, and began biting his nails, a way he had when he was puzzled. The amanuensis looked up from her work. Then it turned out that I had put my chair in the way of his course across the room. I removed it by accident; profuse were the doctor's thanks; he instantly resumed his perambulations and his dictation without impediment.

But preoccupation of mind has its drawbacks, as I found to my cost, for when Dr. Neale was due to preach for me at an octave of services I was holding in Manchester, the intending preacher took a ticket to Liverpool, and found himself there instead. Fortunately I had an excellent substitute in the late eloquent Provost Fortescue, but the disappointment of the congregation who had assembled to hear the divine to whom the Church of England is indebted for "Jerusalem the Golden" was indescribable.

The reaction in favour of the great work to which Dr. Neale devoted his life, that of Sisterhoods, is one of the most notable facts in the modern history of the Church of England. Some of us can call to mind the obloquy cast on Dr. Pusey and Miss Sellon, the howlings and hootings with which their names were assailed at Protestant meetings, the "evil surmisings" which imputed the worst motives to them. Perhaps the persecution which Dr. Neale underwent was all the more intense because he was looked upon as a renegade from the Evangelicism in which he had been brought up. He and the Sisters were pelted with stones and mud at Lewes, mobbed at Brighton, and burnt in effigy somewhere else. For twelve years, owing to misrepresentations subsequently retracted, his Bishop refused to license him. Neale's revenge was to dedicate to his lordship his volume of "Seatonian Prize Poems." The Bishop lived to regret this act of authority, and to withdraw his inhibition. It might indeed be said of Neale what was said of Cranmer —"To do him an act of injury was the way to reap a benefit from him." One day a country parson was travelling on the Brighton line, and had got to Three Bridges Junction where the train stopped. Here was a sight on which he gazed with feelings indescribable. Could he indeed believe his eyes? Was he really in Protestant England? Was he really living in the middle of this enlightened nineteenth century? Could it be true? Why there, there on the platform was a group of nuns in habits and veils, and all the paraphernalia of the Popery of the "dark ages." But what were they about? Some were carrying baskets, and some were leading tiny children by the hand. And the guards and stationmaster and porters were smiling a welcome, and helping the party into carriages reserved for them, with that readiness and good nature and disregard of trouble which these officials—most of them, I daresay, husbands and fathers—show on school pleasure trips, and with many tokens of respect for the Sisters. The journey had passed cheerily enough, for up to that moment he had been engaged in the delightful occupation of cutting open and perusing his *Record* newspaper, damp and fresh from the press. As it happened too, he had just finished a philippic against Sisterhoods in general, and East Grinstead in particular, and Dr. Neale as the *fons et origo mali.* Could these be the very Sisters? Yes! it was the junction for East Grinstead, and there they were as large as life, and the worst of it was both Sisters and children looked provokingly happy—about the very ring of their laughter there could be no doubt. So that whatever their secret penances, whatever their deeds of darkness, they *looked* like "children of the light." The Sisters had no "Witch of Endor" look about them, they were not "weird Sisters," and the faces of their little charges were radiant with smiles. But for his Protestantism the good man would have smiled too; but just before the guard sounded his whistle a porter approached the door out of which this passenger was leaning head and shoulders. "By your leave, sir," and in was pushed an absent-looking gentleman, quite out of breath, and barely in time to save the train. "All right this time, sir," said the guard with a respectful salute as he put the whistle to his mouth, "but if I might *advise* (with great emphasis on the word *advise*), if I was *you*, sir, I'd not cut it quite so close." The train moved on, and the two sat down opposite to each other. "An extraordinary sight that, sir, and extraordinary times these we live in," said the first occupant of the carriage, expecting to find a sympathising listener. His companion hardly knew what to say, and thought silence the best policy. So the old clergyman said, thinking he had not been heard and raising his voice, "Are those really the so-called Sisters under the notorious Dr. Neale?" What the reply would have been I do not know, for just at this moment peals of laughter were heard from the next compartment, and shortly after this the train stopped, and out trooped the Sisters and the children. "Please to allow me to pass, sir," said the other gentleman, who was, I need not say, Dr. Neale. But this, of course, his companion was not aware of. So when he was left alone he called up a guard. "Who is that clergyman that just got out?" "Why I thought, sir, every one on this line knew him. Why that's Dr. Neale, and those ladies are the Sisters, and the children are the orphans." "They look very happy," said the old parson. "They'd need to be, sir," was the reply. But here the whistle sounded again, and the good man was left to his reflections and his *Record*. But somehow or other, he did not feel very comfortable for having spoken of a brother clergyman to his face as "notorious." He did not like having done so, for he was a Trinity man, and Dr. Neale was a Trinity man; and, as every one knows, Trinity men are somewhat punctilious. So he wrote to Dr. Neale to recall the expression, and Dr. Neale wrote back an amusing letter, with a Latin pun on the word in it. I do not know whether the two exchanged anything more than correspondence, but I dare say one of them came to see that even a partisan newspaper is not always infallible. I happened to be a guest at the College just about the time when the work of the Sisterhood was beginning to tell, and when a reaction in favour of its founder was setting in. It was the 5th of November, and Sussex was then notorious for the display of its Protestantism, and for the zeal with which this great Protestant festival used to be kept up. Well, on the College Green, and throwing a lurid light on the quaint old buildings, bonfires were lit, tar barrels set on fire, and squibs let off, and thither frequented the whole populace of East Grinstead. The S. Agnes girls had coaxed Dr. Neale to let them go to see the fireworks, and I volunteered to head them up from the school to the College. So I marshalled them in due order, when in rather a lonely part of the road we encountered a lot of young fellows letting off crackers. I rather hesitated what to do with my little group, but I had no cause for alarm, for no sooner were we recognised than the word passed from mouth to mouth, "The Sisters," "The Sisters," and then the youths and hobbedehoys stood aside respectfully to let the procession pass, and not a squib was fired till we were far out of gunshot. When we arrived at the College Green, several men had made "*Guys*" of themselves in various guises, and amongst them I discerned a man grotesquely got up in a sack, out of which the end had been cut, pulled over his head and shoulders, surmounted by a queer-shaped head-dress not unlike an Eastern caftan. The man was walking solemnly about with his hands clasped, whilst the lads and lasses seemed to be on the broad grin. I asked what it meant, at which the rowdies grinned all the more. Then I found the "*Guy*" was a take-off of a Greek archimandrite, who had been on a visit to the Warden the week before. So I said to the wearer of the strange vestments, "I'm afraid that's hardly kind to a stranger, and I'm sure you would not wish to offend the good Doctor." "Eh! dear," replied the man, "but I never thought of that," and in a minute he went away, and divested himself of his disguise. When I told Dr. Neale, he said that a very few years before it would have been at the peril of their lives for him or the Sisters to have been out in the crowd on Guy Faux Day.

A little later on, one of the Sisters was travelling in a third-class carriage to Tenby, when on this side of Cardiff, two "lewd fellows of the baser sort" got in and made some slighting remarks on the Sister's dress, meanwhile staring her rather impudently in the face. But this roused a sailor at the further end of the carriage, and over the divisions and seats he strode, and with upraised fist he thus addressed the men :—

"Now, my hearties, just you hold your din, and keep your tongues within your jaws; for, by the Lord Harry, if you affront this lady, I'll give you both such a milling that your mothers that bore you won't know you. That lady's a Sister, and when I was down with fever at Cardiff, one of 'em, if it was not her, nursed me through it as if I had been a babby (baby)."

The two men got out at the next station, and the Sister entered into conversation with the sailor, who, it is needless to say, showed her every politeness. She was thankful, however, that there was no occasion for the display of her protector's prowess.

As I have already hinted, Dr. Neale was originally brought up as the Wilberforces and other noted High Churchmen were, as a strict Evangelical. But it was by the best representatives of the school. His father, the Rev. Cornelius Neale, like the Rev. Henry Martin, took the highest University honours; he was Senior Wrangler, First Smith's Prizeman, and Chancellor's Medallist. His mother was daughter of Dr. John Mason Good, after whom he was named, an able physician, an accomplished linguist and versifier. So that, like other clever men, Dr. Neale inherited great abilities as well as the traditions of a party which, at that time, numbered many noted men, and was distinguished for much earnestness and piety.

One curious circumstance was his invincible dislike to mathematics. This dislike, says a friend, "proved disastrous to his hopes of graduating with distinction, for the iron rule which compels all candidates for the Classical Tripos to take mathematical honours first, resulted in his being unable to secure the prize which was universally adjudged to him by those who knew his powers." He was confessedly the first classic of his year. At Cambridge he was a pupil of the renowned Richard Shilleto.

Shilleto, like Bishops Lee and Lightfoot, and other great Cambridge scholars, seemed to have the faculty of making his interviews with his pupils pleasant. "I could sit," Neale says, "with Shilleto from morning till night." It is impossible to conceive anything of the sort more delightful. A proof of the veneration in which he held the great Evangelical leader, the Rev. Charles Simeon, may be gathered from the fact that, at Cambridge, he attended his meetings long after his own principles were being developed in a directly Church line.

Speaking of Simeon's death, he says in a letter, "When I came in I heard that Mr. Simeon was gone. He died at two minutes past two, and I, as you may easily conceive, have thought of little else all day since. I have not yet heard any particulars. So the day he has been preparing for for fifty-six years has come at last. Oh, what a meeting he and Henry Martin must have had! All the pleasure of thinking of that would be taken away by that horrible thought that friends will not know each other in another world. I cannot think how any one can believe it. Poor Mr. Simeon; I cannot tell you how much I am grieved for his loss. I should think there was a great deal of sorrow to-night in Cambridge. I was going to say what a glorious night for him, but there is no night there."

As to Neale's Cambridge life, one of his biographers writes: "Riding, boating, athletic games had no charm for this young collegian. Books were his passion; he read at meals, he read walking, he read driving, and what he read he forgot not. He now and always read everything that came to hand, but took special delight in poetry, biography, and history. His life was not altogether sedentary. Long country walks with a book or a friend were delightful to him, and he had already thrown himself enthusiastically into the study since called ecclesiology, but which was then in a nameless and embryo state. The ecclesiastical buildings scattered over the country in various stages of neglect and decay had for him an irresistible fascination, and his greatest delight lay in making expeditions to the neighbouring villages, and noting all the peculiarities of these old churches. And while he was thus unconsciously preparing to become a great ecclesiastical antiquarian, likewise he was beginning those other studies of patristic and mediæval literature in which also he was to rise to so great excellence."

His greatest work at Cambridge was in connection with the Cambridge Camden, afterwards called the Ecclesiological Society.

A writer in the *Saturday Review* of December 12, 1885,* says: "It was a bold enterprise on the part of two undergraduates of Trinity College, Cambridge—John Mason Neale, in his third year, and Benjamin Webb, a freshman—to undertake at the far-off date of 1839, to reconstruct the visible worship and church architecture of England. Confessedly their movement was an off-shoot of what was still literally Tractarianism at Oxford, for the Tracts were still continuing to come out; but they took up the revival at the point at which the Oxford leaders left it weakest. Their college tutor, Archdeacon Thorpe, welcomed the bold suggestion with good humoured encouragement; and a small knot of fellow-workmen was soon collected, including, amongst others, the present Bishop of Carlisle, the late Archdeacon Freeman, Professor F. A. Paley, Professor Venables, and Mr. Beresford Hope, while among the Seniors, Dr. Mill gave the aid of his great name; a society was formed, called—why, it might be difficult to say—"The Cambridge Camden Society." In this case, as in so many others, the start was three-quarters of the battle, and for a term of years covering two generations of undergraduate life, the Camden Society was a noteworthy element in Cambridge life, active, self-assured, and, it must be owned, not overburdened with deference for academic authority, and accordingly duly resented in turn by old-fashioned Dons.

How could it be otherwise, when, as a contemporary of Neale's at Trinity tells us:† "There was the attempt of certain Trinity men to shame the Fellows and Dons of colleges into something like a respectable attendance at the college chapels, attendance being rigidly enforced upon the undergraduates. This was attempted by publishing lists of attendance upon the part of the Dons, and actually by offering the prize of a handsome Bible to the one who attended most regularly. The prize was secured by a Fellow who afterwards became a Colonial Bishop ; but it would have been given to a well-known Dean had it not been part of his every-day duty as Dean to be present at chapel. Some profanely called this effort 'A Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Dons.'"

---

* In an obituary notice of Mr. Beresford Hope.

† The Rev. Edward J. Boyce, *S. Margaret's Magazine*, No. 3, p. 124.

I have not space to pursue the fortunes of the Society, either under its original or new name, during the twenty-seven years of its existence, nor of the great work it accomplished. Those who are curious in such matters may find much to interest them, especially in the early volumes of the "Ecclesiologist." Mr. Mowbray's well-known "Reformation and Deformation" was not exaggerated.

The "Ecclesiologist" continued to be published until December 1868, the last number being the one hundred and fifty-third, it had reached its majority—exactly twenty-one years.

In the number for October 1866, occurs the following "In Memoriam" :

"It is scarcely necessary to say in this place that Mr. Neale was one of the original founders of the Cambridge Camden Society, and one of the earliest and ablest and most constant contributors to the pages of the 'Ecclesiologist.' He lived long enough to see the complete triumph of the great principles for which he had laboured so zealously. . . . He has left behind him the reputation of being one of the most learned theologians, one of the most erudite scholars, one of the best linguists, one of the sweetest hymnologists, or perhaps the foremost liturgicist of his time."

I cannot pretend to pass any judgment on his poems, and I would not undertake the ungracious task of criticising them were I competent to do so. Some persons allege that his metres occasionally halt, and that he now and then introduced ill-adapted words and disjointed rhythms. But the influence of his hymns is indisputable, and they are valued wherever the English language is known. Many a sad soul has been cheered by his translation from the Greek, "Art thou weary? art thou sore distrest?" Many a mourner has been comforted by his rendering from the Latin, "Brief life is here our portion." Many a Christian has learnt to realise the Communion of Saints by his "Jerusalem the Golden," and had his faith and love kindled by his "Jesus the very thought is sweet," "O happy band of pilgrims," and many other hymns and translations too numerous to name. What Dr. Dykes did for hymn tunes, Dr. Neale, as it seems to me, did for hymns. Nor do I feel competent to speak as it deserves of his greatest work, and with which his name will always be connected—the foundation of the Convent or Sisterhood of S. Margaret. Suffice it to say that in this and its daughter foundations has been realised the truth that in acts of self-sacrifice and self-devotion on the part of Christian women this prosaic nineteenth century is not behind any period of the Church's history. The religious life has been as thoroughly realised by these noble-hearted daughters of the Church of England as in any other part of the Church Catholic, and that in the most real and practical ways, such as the care of the sick, the charge of orphans, the education of girls, the preparation of vestments of grace and beauty, besides direct missionary work undertaken in our large centres of population.

His reputation as a Church historian and liturgist was known all over Europe, especially in Russia and Greece. The Emperor Nicholas recognised the value of his History of the Eastern Church by presenting him with a valuable manuscript endorsed with the imperial autograph. "His loss," says G. M., "is felt far beyond the bounds of the little English Church of which he was so faithful a member. I myself was in a Russian Church after his decease, I did not know the priest nor he me, but I went up before the *Liturgy* began, and told him of our loss, asking him to remember the departed in the prayers of the Office. He expressed the most lively sorrow at the news, and immediately complied with my request, first asking what was his Christian name, as by the baptismal name alone the Eastern Church makes memorial of the departed." *

Speaking of the hold Neale quietly gained over the hearts of those who saw much of him, the same old acquaintance says : "He was ever most kind and considerate towards the workmen employed on the new convent buildings, and was on the spot many times a day to watch their progress. After he was taken ill he went to see the building now and then in a hand-chair. As soon as he arrived on the spot several of them were ready to carry him chair and all round the works, that he might not be shaken by the rough paths. Very often they have with tears expressed their desire to see him about with them again. On the day of his funeral it was thought better that all but the bearers (who were purposely chosen from *his* workmen) should continue their work. The Sisters yielded to what appeared to them their better judgment on this arrangement. But, poor fellows, they could not keep away, they almost all gave up work and came to the funeral. It was a touching sight."

---

* He was only forty-nine when he died.

And another circumstance witnessed to his widespread influence, and that was that around the same grave were representatives of all branches of the Church Catholic, Greek, Roman, and Anglican. When, too, the tidings of his death were telegraphed to the Patriarch of Holy Russia, the same bell tolled for Dr. Neale which is used for dignified ecclesiastics of the Orthodox Communion. The following Sunday his hymns were sung in countless churches, and what more suitable considering the comparative shortness of his busy life, for he died at the age of forty-nine years, than the favourite words:

"Brief life is here our portion,
  Brief sorrow, short-lived care;
The life that knows no ending,
  The tearless life is there.

"The morning shall awaken,
  The shadows shall decay;
And each true-hearted servant
  Shall shine as doth the day."

There in his quiet grave in the beautiful churchyard of East Grinstead surmounted by the emblem of salvation, he sleeps till the awakening at the Resurrection of the Just.

ARCHBISHOP TAIT.

From *The Sunday at Home* (London), August. 1891.

THE memoir of the late Primate, jointly written by his son-in-law, the present Bishop of Rochester, and by the Rev. William Benham, is the story of a saintly and beautiful life, as well as of a great ecclesiastical statesman and leader. Of the latter aspect of character, nothing can be written in these pages, but there are personal incidents and features that call for remark. Behind the prelate there was the man; devout, simple-minded, earnest, loving, and beloved. His biographers have dealt with his private life in a tender and discriminating manner, but they have told enough to awaken interest and admiration.*

Archibald Campbell Tait was born on December 22, 1811, at Harviestoun, Clackmannanshire, where his father owned property, as well as in Edinburgh and elsewhere; much of which was lost through subsequent reverses of fortune. Two years later he was deprived of a fond mother, who left behind her nine children. The younger ones were tended by a faithful nurse, Betty Morton, who afterwards accompanied Archibald to Edinburgh, when he entered the famous Academy, and then to Glasgow, when he became a student in the University. Her affection for him and his gratitude for her motherly care continued unabated, and the faithful old nurse died with her hand clasped in his, as the morning broke on the opening day of the year 1834. Her memory was cherished among the members of the family, and when, twenty-two years later, her favourite became Bishop of London, he and they asked what Betty would have said?

The dispositions of the father and son were singularly unlike, but a remarkable friendship and mutual confidence subsisted between them. The father took a deep interest in his son's studies, both at school and in college, and maintained a close correspondence with him on matters affecting his personal character and academic life. A memorandum book was found in his library, on his death in May, 1832, containing elaborate notes of his ideas and plans respecting his youngest and favourite son, and expressing not only his unchanged pride and joy in him, but unabated confidence in his future greatness. Long afterwards, the then Bishop of London, writing to his own son, an undergraduate at Oxford, said: "This day, thirty-six years ago, my father died. I heard of it in my rooms at Balliol, the day after I had returned from the Easter vacation. I was then twenty. I shall never forget how he used to write to me while I was in Glasgow, and how, though forty-eight years older than me, he was as much my companion as if he had been my brother."

Such confidence and pride were well-merited. As a student, he was diligent and painstaking. He reaped the reward in various honours and prizes, culminating in the Snell scholarship, which entitled him to a further course of education at Balliol College, Oxford. There he worked hard and successfully, winning a Fellowship in November, 1834, before he had completed his twenty-third year. Within twelve months he was appointed tutor of his college, and on Trinity Sunday, 1836, was ordained deacon by Bishop Bagot, of Oxford. He undertook, as a voluntary service, the charge of a vacant curacy at Marsh Baldon, a neglected district five miles from Balliol, where he continued to labour for five years, notwithstanding the onerous duties of his Fellowship and Tutorship, and the other public work devolving upon him in the University during the troublous and stormy times of the Newmanite controversies.

---

* "Archbishop Tait," by Randall T. Davidson and William Benham. *Macmillan.*

A new career was opened by his appointment to succeed Dr. Thomas Arnold, as head master of Rugby, in July, 1842. The spirit in which he entered upon his duties finds expression in an entry in his diary: "Let me view this event, not as success, but as the opening up of a fresh field of labour in Thy vineyard. Give me a holy heart. Give me boldness and firmness in Thy service. Give me unfailing perseverance. Banish all indolence. Give me freedom from worldly ambition. O Lord! I have much labour before me, much to do of a secular character. Grant that this may never draw me from regular habits of devotion, without which the Christian life cannot be preserved in me." In this frame of mind he carried on his great work at Rugby, with credit to himself and to the advantage of the school, until stricken down in 1848 by rheumatic fever, which left him so enfeebled and shaken that in the following year he accepted the Deanery of Carlisle, as an agreeable and necessary change.

In the early Rugby days he had married Catherine, youngest daughter of Archdeacon Spooner, who for five-and-thirty years was a devoted partner and helpmeet. The touching story is told by the Archbishop himself in the memoir of his wife and their beloved son, Craufurd, both of whom were taken away in 1878; the latter, at the age of twenty-nine, just as he was entering on a ministerial course that promised great usefulness. The parents were called upon during their married life to endure heavy trials in the loss of children. The mother's hand has given to the world a sacred record which will live in English literature, and which is already known and reverenced in every land. Scarlet fever in a virulent form broke out in Carlisle early in 1856, and within the short space of four weeks the Dean and his wife were bereft of five little children. The marks of this great sorrow were never wholly eradicated. In his private diary, and in his intimate correspondence, Tait frequently refers to it, especially at the recurrence of the anniversaries. That it exerted a hallowing influence upon his own character is manifest from the way in which he acquitted himself under circumstances of severe trial in his high positions, when his conduct was misunderstood and his motives were impugned; and from the tender sympathy which he was always ready to manifest towards bereaved and mourning friends.

One specimen of the latter may be quoted. It was written in 1867:—"I almost fear that before this reaches you, your beloved boy will have left you. How bitter the trial to parents none can know but those who have gone through it, and if it please God thus to visit you, long indeed will it be before any brightness can return to life. I trust it may yet please God to preserve him to you, and make him grow up to be a blessing to many. But if he is taken, the thought of the sorrows and trials he escapes will gradually comfort you, and there is certainly something that raises and cheers in the assured belief that our children are already with Christ, ready to welcome us when, through His mercy, we ourselves shall be admitted to the same glorious presence. The death of a child, and of such a child, has in it an inexpressible sweetness, when we can forget the suffering and all the harrowing details, in the one thought that he is with Jesus. We ourselves are able to think calmly what a far better lot has been given to our beloved Catty and May, than if now, in the twenty-first and twentieth years of their early womanhood, they had been beginning the real difficulties of life here among us; though God knows how sweet was the companionship which they gave promise of affording us, had they been allowed to stay with us till now."

The maturing and ripening of Christian character can be easily traced throughout the memoir. When recovery from his illness at Rugby seemed hopeless, he took solemn leave of his family and friends, and sent special messages to others. One of these, to Principal Shairp, was thus expressed:—"Tell him I have perfect peace from faith in the simplest of all truths, that Christ died for the ungodly." When entering upon the responsible duties of the Bishopric of London, in October, 1856, he wrote in his diary: "Let me dedicate myself afresh, O Lord, to Thee. In this new sphere give me more than ever the spirit of prayer, of holy meditation, of holy zeal, of right judgment, of Christian boldness, and of Christian meekness. Grant that the insidious temptations of the trappings of worldly greatness may not impede my heavenward course. I feel the danger. Raise my soul heavenwards, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Twenty-one years later, the same secret record has this entry, on

Good Friday, 1877 :—" O Lord, how wonderfully hast Thou dealt with me in past years! I trust I am not settled on my lees. Lord, keep me ever fresh in Thy service. What a whirl was I plunged in when I went to London! Keep me from the petty cares of party warfare. Darken not my last years with these frivolous and bitter disputes which rend the Church. They have ever been endeavouring to mar spiritual life during the twenty years of my episcopate. Lord, keep my faith and zeal fresh."

Utterances such as these are frequent. Of their sincerity there can be no doubt. Special need existed for vigilance, humility, and devotion. During the twelve years that Bishop Tait filled the See of London, and still more during the fourteen years of his primacy, he was exposed to an incessant strain of work and to not a few temptations inseparable from his high position. Only by methodical and ceaseless labour could he keep pace with the demands upon his time and attention. The claims of his diocese were alone sufficient to absorb his energies, but, in addition, there were duties in Parliament and in Convocation, the interests of the great societies and institutions connected with the Church, an immense correspondence, and social obligations that could not be avoided. When he became Archbishop, responsibilities were superadded from the peculiar and anxious times in which he lived, and from the way in which the Episcopal Churches in the Colonies and in America looked to him for counsel and help; while his public appearances became more frequent and his public utterances had to be carefully weighed.

Amidst all these grave responsibilities the Archbishop maintained the intense warmth of his home affections. Nothing delighted or soothed him more than to leave the excitement and ceremonial of Lambeth Palace for the comparative quiet of Addington, or for a brief Continental tour. He enjoyed fully what he loved to call " the bosom of the family." The private diaries of his busiest and most anxious years are largely occupied with brief entries respecting his home and family life. He writes on Easter Sunday, 1879 :—" A week of quiet rest at Addington. The solemnity of the return to this dear place is great indeed. To-day, at the Holy Communion in the lovely church, adorned with all its Easter beauties, I felt the presence of the beloved ones very near." Again he writes, when at Lambeth:—" Our wedding day. Thirty-seven years since that bright summer morning when we went together to the dear little church at Elmdon. I have been alone in the chapel here, thinking it all over after the day's work was done. Amid blessings and trials how does life pass! Blessed Saviour, stand by me to the end. Blessed Father, into Thy hands I give myself and all I love."

His home life was uniformly simple and beautiful. " Given to hospitality," and from the exigencies of his position compelled to entertain much company, he yet found sweet and special solace in the inner ciacle of those dearest to him. He loved to listen to the reading of books of general literature, interspersing shrewd comments, and taking a foremost part in kindly criticism. One who knew him well, and who has an exceptional right to speak, says, " To see how a man, as ceaselessly occupied as he was with public affairs, was yet able to combine with these the very tenderest relations—free, and happy, and unreserved—towards his own family, gave one an ideal, practically realised, of what family life should be." The Bishop of Rochester truly says in the memoir :—" The strain of monotonous work, and the tension of difficult situations, may oftentimes be lightened and relaxed by one who has a keen, and withal a good-natured eye for the humorous side of even the gravest facts of life. It is, perhaps, a rare quality in ecclesiastics, and in most men it is not without its peril. In the Archbishop it was accompanied by an earnestness so intense, and a sympathy so tender, that I do not believe he ever, in this particular way, gave a moment's pain to any one."

Yet he could administer a deserved rebuke in a dignified manner. A worthy man, for example, wrote to him at some length, asking him to consider the question whether, " since the Ascension of our Blessed Lord into heaven, it was not right that the Lord's Prayer should be used with a clause as to His mediatorial work appended, as is the rule in other Christian prayers." The reply, by the hand of a chaplain, was as follows :—" I am directed by the Archbishop to say that it does not appear to him to be necessary that you should undertake to make any additions to the Lord's Prayer." He honestly valued criticism, and used to say that if he had been cured of certain early habits of awkwardness in public speaking, it was entirely due to seeing himself " wholesomely caricatured." An instance is recorded of his sending for the ponderous book in which newspaper extracts were pasted, in order to show to his tailor a cartoon of himself from " Punch," with the remark :—" I want you particularly to notice how the British public regards your gaiters."

He usually wrote his sermons with the utmost care, and would correct and alter them for subsequent delivery, often when driving to the church. Once being so engaged, he heard a loud noise, and saw a runaway horse with a heavy dray making for his carriage. He stood up, sermon in hand, and as the horse approached he threw the sermon in its face. The animal was so bewildered by the fluttering of the leaves that it swerved and paused ; the driver regained control ; the sermon was recovered ; and the prelate went on his way. Describing the incident on his return, he said, "I don't know whether my sermon did any good to the congregation to-day, but it was of considerable service to myself ;" adding, "I don't suppose the poor beast ever had such a 'blatter' of theology before."

Under date of May 8, 1881, he records a dinner at the Mansion House, given by the Lord Mayor to Dr. Moffat, the African Missionary, whose speech, says the Archbishop, "was very interesting, but he seemed likely to continue the reminiscences of his fifty years' work in Africa long beyond midnight, had not his octogenarian neighbour, Lord Shaftesbury, more accustomed to measure the endurance of assemblies than the solitary missionary, pulled him down by the coat-tails after he had spoken half-an-hour."

In dealing with his vast and varied correspondence the Archbishop had the assistance of his chaplains, but he was scrupulous in having replies sent even to the many letters that curiosity or indolence inflict upon exalted personages on matters with which they have no concern. As years advanced, he grew less and less inclined to read letters himself or to write the answers ; but, with a few necessary exceptions, each letter was read to him and he indicated a reply, if this was not fully dictated. His favourite mode was to do this while walking about the room or in the garden. Often he would keep back a letter to "simmer" for a day, so that he might reconsider his intended reply. This arose from his constant anxiety to do nothing that might appear harsh or unkind. Even when some bore had to be replied to, or some preposterous request refused, he would only say, "Tell him he is a consummate ass, but do it very kindly."

Pathetic entries frequently occur, after another prolonged illness in 1869–70, of his feeling tired and weary. But he kept at work until the last. Even though laid aside from active effort for some time before his death, he never ceased to take a deep interest in the affairs both of the Church and of the nation. From his sick-room at Addington a holy influence emanated, and one of the last acts of his life, though one not universally approved. was to intervene as a peacemaker in a matter that had long agitated and disturbed the Church. His son-in-law writes :—"As the acuter stage of his illness came to an end, the look of pain and weariness passed quite away, and for many weeks he was full of keen and vigorous interest in all that was going on, and enlivened the business of each day with the same quiet humour as of old. He had no wish, I think, for recovery, and what he dreaded above all things was that his life should be prolonged as a helpless invalid. For his more strictly devotional hours, the privilege of daily ministering to him in those long weeks of illness is one that cannot be forgotten by those on whom the duty lay. Never did the manly courage of his Christian faith assert itself with more unaffected courage and simplicity than in the 'quietness and confidence' of the daily prayers in that sick room. To be with him at such an hour was to receive in very truth 'the peace of God which passeth all understanding.'"

Thus, gradually and peacefully, he drew near the end. Intimate friends came to take a solemn leave of him, and were sent away with a benediction. Faithful servants were not forgotten. He dictated and tried to write a farewell message to the Queen, in response to a special inquiry :—"A last memorial of twenty-six years of devoted service ; with earnest love and affectionate blessing on the Queen and her family." Loved ones around his bedside joined with him in the Holy Communion, uttered familiar hymns and Scripture passages, and at his own request, offered the commendatory prayer from Bishop Andrewes. On Advent Sunday morning, 1882, he tranquilly breathed his last. His youngest daughter, who has since joined him, wrote in her diary :—"It was a quiet, happy time. in spite of the anxiety and need of patience both for him and us. We always feel as if we had spent that time like the pilgrims in the land of Beulah, waiting for the messenger and the crossing of the river ; and he was like Mr. Standfast, for the day he was to cross, 'there was a great calm at that time in the river,' and it was so quiet and so shallow that 'when he was about half-way in, he stood a while, and talked to his companions that had waited upon him hither.'"

PALESTINE TROUBLES.

From *The Rock* (Ch. Eng.), London, September 4, 1891.

We have received, just as we go to press, the document in which the Archbishop and his brother Bishops have expressed themselves about the troubles in Palestine, and the action on the one hand of Bishop Blyth, and, on the other, of the Church Missionary Society and its missionaries. It is manifest that our comments upon it this week must be hastily penned. It must also be some time before the Church Missionary Society can pronounce upon it, for though there is the monthly General Committee on Tuesday next, when probably the Archbishop's opinion will be mentioned, the majority of the members will be away on holiday, and consequently we cannot expect more than a brief talk over the matter with an adjournment of the discussion for more deliberate and prayerful judgment at a later date. We do, however, congratulate His Grace and his assessors upon the Christian caution and earnest spirit manifested in that which they have written, and we must in so grave a crisis thank the Father of spirits for having so guided them. We doubt if there is, except in one paragraph, more than a phrase or two here and there which the Society need hesitate to accept frankly, and we are sure that if Bishop Blyth will but act in future according to the tone and temper of the counsel here offered, there need be no further difficulties.

The five points upon which the Archbishop and Bishops have conferred are—first, the Bishop's presence at, and desire to preside over, the Missionary Conference; secondly, the relations of the clergy, and particularly the native clergy to the Bishop; thirdly, the work amongst Mohammedans; fourthly, the charge against the Society of proselytising from the Eastern Churches; and, lastly, the refusal by the Bishop of confirmation where a person joining our Church had already in his own Church had the rite of Chrism. Substantially, the verdict is in favour of the Society on all these heads, although the Society is, as we should expect from Bishops, advised to "give the utmost consideration to the Bishop's suggestions." As to the Conference, it is admitted that it is a body constituted altogether by the Society, with a chairman not permanent, but elected each time the Conference meets. It is, however, recommended that the Bishop be not summoned to it, seeing that if he comes he may not be asked to preside. Yet the Archbishop of Canterbury himself attends the Society's annual meeting in Exeter Hall without thinking of presiding, and without the least forfeiture of dignity or consideration on that account. Bishop Blyth is counselled to have a Synod of all his clergy, officially summoned by himself. Our one objection to this would be that it excludes the laity, but that is a Church question within the Bishop's competence as matters stand in Dioceses, whether at home or abroad. It has no direct concern with a Missionary Society. The Bishops say that, during the interregnum, when there was no Bishop in Palestine, the Missionary Conference, not without necessity, "discussed matters which are not properly within its scope." What is intended probably is not that a private Conference had not manhood's right to discuss whatever it wished, but that the result of these discussions became public, and that action was taken upon resolutions of Conference. In the issue, probably, the Bishop will do as Bishops elsewhere are content to do; he will have his own diocesan organisation, a part of which the C.M.S. ordained agents must necessarily become. Whatever troubles arise in other dioceses are adjusted by common sense and Christian charity. Why should not the same be in Palestine?

As to clergy and their licenses, nothing could be wiser than the remark that mutual consideration "should obviate any need of rules." Where suspension of a native clergyman by his European Superintendent may be unhappily a necessity, this is not to involve loss of salary until his case has been fully adjudicated upon. Here there had been, on the part of a Superintending Missionary, a slight misunderstanding of the rule, for which due apology was made, and there will be no future difficulty. The suspension was perfectly right, but the salary should have been continued to the native Curate. The Bishop is desired, where he licenses clergy for work amongst Jews in areas already occupied by C.M.S. missionaries, to define and limit such licenses. This, if agreed to by Bishop Blyth, will settle a case about which there has been some not unnatural sensitiveness.

As to missions to Mohammedans, those who know the Archbishop's pet theories will appreciate the intention of the observation that "Some diversities in practice are not only unavoidable but are even desirable." The fiercest onslaught upon the Society was in the charge about Proselytism, and we are glad to learn that Bishop Blyth "has now declared himself thankful that the Society thus distinctly repudiates the employment of agents for aggressive purposes;" and the Bishop thinks that personal explanation has "smoothed the difficulties of the present situation." It is a polite way of returning the verdict "not proven," but we fear that here on neither side has the last word been said. We, however, will leave our readers to read the paragraph, and we will not propose further comment this week on a most intricate and delicate portion of the situation. On the question of refusing Confirmation, which Bishop Blyth had determinedly done, the award is that "laying-on of hands ought not to be refused," where there is the true and conscientious desire for it on the part of the candidate.

In the concluding paragraphs a pregnant hint is given that the Church of England has as much right in Palestine as other churches. This has been overlooked by many of the hottest of the controversialists. We are no more intruders there than the Greek Church; we have only been later in going there. The Latin Church, which many of our Ritualistic friends admire, has had no scruples about pushing itself into the country. In the last sentences there is a hope of more amicable relations, which we most heartily respond to. We have bated the incisiveness of our remarks, because we are most anxious that there should be peace, if possible. So infinite are the human interests involved, so supreme is the duty of preaching the truth as it is in Jesus upon the soil hallowed by His own footsteps, that we ought to suffer but one motive to actuate us, namely, love of Him and love of those for whom He died. We ought solely to be guided by the one principle, what would He do were He treading that sacred land to-day? If we are sure that He would faithfully rebuke man, so must we. If we have no doubt whatever that He would not spare corruptions, neither must we. If we believe that in doing this He would use gentle words and persuasive means, so must we. Our severity must always be less than His, because we do not possess His knowledge of the truth, and His insight into human character. Our lovingness of heart can never equal His, for He was the Love itself.

LAY MINISTRATIONS IN CHURCH.

From *The Guardian* (Ch. Eng.), London, August 19, 1891.

ALL the world knows that the Bishop of London is a very bold man. Every year brings some fresh proof of his courage, and one, not the least striking, was given on the 21st of March last, when, by an act of single-handed authority, he enriched the Church of England with a new order of ministers. On that day, in the presence of a great congregation in St. Paul's Cathedral, with prayer and exhortation and symbolical acts, he appointed certain laymen to preach and conduct divine service in consecrated buildings. It is true that this startling commission is hedged by certain conditions: it is revocable by the Bishop, it can only be exercised where and when the incumbent wishes it, and it applies, not to the sacraments, and not to the obligatory matins and evensong, but only to "extra services." But, even making allowance for these limitations, it is certainly a grave innovation. What is most surprising is that it passed at the time and since with so little observation. But now that the new order of ministers has been for nearly six months at work, and that it has extended to at least one diocese outside London, it seems high time for Churchmen to bestow some attention on an experiment "charged," as Mr. Harry Jones says, "with seminal possibilities" of the highest moment. We shall not now argue the theoretical permissibility of laymen's ministrations, from the point of view of the constitution and order of the Catholic Church. The organic relation between the ordained priesthood and the whole "spirit-bearing body" of baptised Christians was drawn out by a master-hand in Bishop Moberly's Bampton Lectures. The first principles of the matter seem plain enough. Only two functions are the exclusive prerogative of the priesthood, in such a sense that no one not in priest's orders can possibly perform them. Only a priest can consecrate the Eucharist or absolve the penitent, but every other religious rite, including that of Baptism, can, and under fitting circumstances may, be administered by laymen. If this be so, the question before us becomes one of practice rather than of theory. Granting that laymen can, under certain circumstances, preach and conduct religious services, is it expedient that they should do so, by episcopal authority, in the consecrated buildings of the Church of England at the present day?

An important question is whether such ministrations are legal. As members of a Church claiming to be Apostolic, we are bound to look first at their ecclesiastical propriety. But even granting that we are satisfied on that head, the legal consideration arises. The Church of England, as long as she is established, is also an institution of the realm, governed, as regards that aspect of her position, by statute-law. Are the new ministrations compatible with that law? The new order was not hurriedly constituted. A committee, presided over by the Bishop of Marlborough, examined the matter in all its bearings, and spent some two years over the task. The report of the committee was carefully considered by the Bishop and his suffragans. It is not to be supposed that the legal question was overlooked; but it is conceivable that it was overshadowed, in devout minds bent on spiritual work, by religious, ecclesiastical, and practical considerations. Certainly, unless the law affecting divine worship in the Church of England has been generally and immemorially misinterpreted, it would seem that an unordained person preaching or conducting service in church commits a legal offence, for which, if it were persisted in, he could be proceeded against and punished. The advocates of the new system contend that the Bishop's permission makes all the difference. To officiate without such permission is illegal: to officiate with it, is legal. But is this so? Has the Bishop, from the legal point of view, this dispensing power? Some critics of the new movement doubt it. They deny that the Bishop's fiat or veto can affect the case. They contend that, if it is lawful for a layman to officiate in church where the incumbent allows it, it is equally lawful whether the Bishop approves or not. His fiat cannot make it more than lawful. His veto cannot make it less. This, it will be observed, is not a mere question of legal and constitutional theory. It has a directly practical bearing. Should it once be established that laymen may lawfully officiate in church, an incumbent of advanced or peculiar views might feel tempted to try the experiment of dispensing with the Bishop's license, and might ask a layman, whose doctrine he knows that the Diocesan would repudiate, to preach in his pulpit. If the congregation, aggrieved, sought the Bishop's help against the intruder, we suspect that his lordship would find it difficult to expel him from the pulpit except by processes which would eventually silence his own nominees.

We turn now from the hypothetical difficulties to the actual aspects of the case. We understand that these "dedicated laymen," as the Bishop of London calls them, lately met in council under the presidency of the Bishop of Marlborough, and compared notes as to the working of the experiment so far, and as to its possible extensions. They reported that their ministrations had been very freely used by the incumbents to whom they were allotted, and they gave interesting details of the amount of work done, especially in the way of Mission services after evensong and children's services. It was unanimously decided that it would be undesirable, at present, for the lay preachers to preach at the morning service on Sunday. It was held that, whenever they officiated, it was more discreet to speak of them as "delivering addresses" than as "preaching sermons." It was agreed that their discourses should rather deal with plain religious and moral duties than with theological doctrine. It was agreed that there was much scope for further developments of their ministerial work —in holding special services at sacred seasons and for special objects; even conducting the Three Hours' devotion on Good Friday. Finally, it was urged by the lay preachers, High Churchmen and Low alike, that they should be allowed to administer the chalice at the Holy Communion.

Now it is obvious that the line of action thus sketched out would have practical conveniences. In parishes where the incumbent is single-handed, or even where he has one or two curates, the immense and increasing number and variety of public ministrations exacted from him exhaust his strength, and leave him really no leisure for meditation or study. To a priest so circumstanced it would be an immense boon if he could, consistently both with ecclesiastical order and with secular law, hand over some of his extra and special services and discourses to a devout and competently instructed layman, working without fee and reward. Even the startling proposal that a layman should administer the chalice touches a physical burden, which, in these days of early and frequent celebrations, is very real and very trying. To this particular innovation we are altogether opposed. It would lead almost inevitably to misunderstanding of Eucharistic doctrine, and in churches where that doctrine is denied or obscured, to great practical irreverence. But in no other department of the work contemplated by the new order could this particular danger arise.

The quite different danger, referred to above, of bringing teachers of strange doctrines into our pulpits, though we conceive that it is a real one, of course does not arise if the Bishop is rightly informed as to the legal efficacy and indispensability of his license. The mischief which chiefly threatens lies in another direction. Nothing is more important than that unlearned members of the Church (and learned ones, too, for that matter) should apprehend clearly, and bear steadily in mind, first, the awful and essential distinction which separates the Eucharistic mysteries from every other part, however edifying, of the Church's public service; and then, strictly in connection with this truth, the indelible difference between those who bear and those who do not bear the august commission of the priesthood. If the experiment which the Bishop of London has inaugurated, with its unaccustomed spectacle of "dedicated laymen" preaching and ministering in consecrated places, tends to obscure these vital distinctions, it may be followed by lamentable and even fatal consequences. If, on the other hand, it serves to make more clear the line which separates the service of the altar from the offices of the choir, and the celebrant of the one from the minister of the others, it may promote the intelligent appreciation of a central truth, while it gives valuable help to the working of the Church in places where the harvest is plenteous but the labourers are all too few.

JESUIT METHODS IN FOREIGN MISSION WORK.

BY W. ROBINSON, SALEM, SOUTH INDIA.

From *The Independent* (Non-Conformist), London, August 14 and 21, 1891.

I.—Ancient.

It is quite time that attention was drawn to this subject, and that, once for all, English people should know what Jesuit methods in foreign missionary work were and are. Protestant missionaries are told by Mr. Caine that they are failures, and that the right way to obtain success is to follow the example of a Jesuit priest, who dresses himself as a Hindu Fakir, who goes through the bazaars with his holy beads and a mendicant's bowl, begging a dole of rice and at the same time preaching the Gospel. This is an effective picture drawn by no unskilful hand, and the only objection against it is the fatal one—that it is untrue to the facts of history and directly contrary to Jesuit methods of work. As a mis-statement it is so stupendous that a man requires to live in India to get its true perspective. Its absurdity is so "gross, open and palpable" that it is difficult to suppose the statement is made seriously. If it is seriously meant, then it is a fashion of making history that Jules Verne or the writer of "Baron Munchausen" might envy.

India is a bookless country, and I am now writing under the disadvantage of not being able to use any material except the scrappy information scattered through the few books of a missionary's library. The Jesuits must have the credit of beginning what may be called the middle period of mission work in India. Macaulay tells us that less than a hundred years ago "the spiritual force of Protestantism was a mere local militia," confined to England and some of her colonies. The Church of Rome was *par excellence* the missionary Church, and had sent forth the best and bravest of her sons to bring Asia to the authority of the Church.

In 1540 St. François Xavier, Apostle of India, came from Portugal to Goa, and made innumerable converts in the ten years he spent in this land. His method of work he thus describes: "I have begun to go through all the villages of this coast, with bell in hand, collecting together a large concourse of both men and boys. Bringing them twice a day into a convenient place, I give them Christian instruction. The boys, in the space of a month, have committed all to memory beautifully. Then I told them to teach what they had learned to their parents, household and neighbours. On Sundays they came together—men, boys, girls and women—into a sacred edifice, with an ardent desire to hear. I began with the confession of the Holy Trinity, the Lord's Prayer, the Angelic Salutation, the Apostles' Creed, pronouncing them in their own language in a clear voice. All followed me in the repetition, in which they take uncommon pleasure. Then I went through the Creed alone, pausing upon each Article, asking whether they believed without any doubt. All, in an equally confident tone, with their hands in the form of a cross on their breast, affirmed that they truly believed it." This is Xavier's own account, but there is a tradition on the Coromandel coast that the great missionary simply collected the people together by ringing a bell, and there and then, pronouncing the words of Absolution, sprinkled them with holy water by means of a brush. In this way he baptized a crowd of people in a few minutes. Without attaching overmuch importance to this tradition, let us remember that Xavier was the accredited agent of the King of Portugal, and that to him doubtless the same instructions were given as were given to Cabral, commander of the second expedition to India A.D. 1500. Marshman says: "He (Cabral) was accompanied by eight friars, and directed to carry fire and sword into every province which would not receive their teaching." Instead of begging his way, carrying a mendicant's bowl and wearing his garb, Xavier's progress was that of a triumphant conqueror, and throughout the whole Peninsula the people regarded him not only as a religious teacher, but also as a political deliverer, who would safeguard their temporal interests. In this double aspect of his work it is not difficult to account for his success, and we may well accord to him the splendid distinction which his French biographer claims—"Apostle of India."

After Xavier came the Jesuit Fathers, and although they are in the succession of his work they dropped his methods entirely. In 1606 the celebrated Robert de Nobili, a relative of Pope Julian the Third and of the Cardinal Bellarmine, arrived in India and entered on a career of preaching which lasted forty years. His energy and self-denial were almost superhuman, his methods were Satanic in their subtlety. He was profoundly learned in the languages and customs of the country. He became all things to all men to a degree that makes one shudder. He became a master of the high and low dialects of the Tamil language, and, disguising himself as a Brahmin, suddenly appeared before the Brahmins of Madura, reputed to be the most learned of their class, and *swore on oath* that, like them, he was descended from Brahma, and had received from him a Divine revelation, which he called the Fourth Veda. The Madura Brahmins were not at first to be taken in, but Nobili's persistence overcame their prejudice. From the beginning he and his brother Jesuits solemnly swore that they were not Europeans, but that they were real Brahmins. They dressed in native costume, they wore the sacred thread, and smeared themselves with holy ashes; they took part in Brahminic ceremonies, repeated prayers to Hindu gods, but substituted the name of the Virgin or of some saint whenever it was possible to do so. They observed caste in all its inhuman exclusiveness. These things, however, did not attract the Brahmins. Nobili's converts were of the Sudra and Pariah class. These were allowed the widest latitude in their profession, and the Christian Sudra joined his Hindu brother in all heathen rites and ceremonies as heretofore. He observed the same rules as to food, bathing and the ordinary intercourse of life. The so-called Christian had his cars and idolatrous processions, as though he were still Hindu. Nobili was a warrior by nature, and he set himself resolutely to conquer or die in planting the Cross in India; at times he had to endure terrible hardships, but again we read that some of the Tributary Rajahs to the King of Madura received the great "Sanyasi" with all distinction.

This unblushing system of deceit went on for 150 years. All distinctions between Christianity and Hinduism were obliterated. It is remarkable to note the way in which lists of the baptized were worked up. This is in more senses than one a true Jesuit method. Thousands of dying children were baptized surreptitiously; Jesuit Catechists, having a knowledge of medicine, were called into native houses, and whilst giving medicine to the sick, the Catechists made over them the sign of the Cross, and counted them as converts to the true faith.

A letter from the missionary Grundler, dated Tranquebar, January 6, 1710, shows how this system of deceit was practised at that time. In 1709 there were no converts, so the Portuguese Church *bought a number of slaves*, at prices varying from eight to sixteen shillings each. When eighty slaves were collected, a public day was fixed, the slaves were marched to church, and there were publicly baptized; not one question was asked at the ceremony. The slaves, now made Christian, were marched in procession through the streets of Tranquebar; small copper coins were scattered among the people. This took place in the territory of the Protestant King of Denmark. Grundler found, on subsequent inquiry, that these Jesuit-made Christians did not even know the Lord's Prayer. Still more surprising is the account of an interview between the Tranquebar missionaries and a Brahmin. The Brahmin had called upon them, and was wearing his sacred thread; he had also the distinguishing marks of his caste and all the outward badges of heathenism. To the surprise of the missionaries, the Brahmin declared himself to be a Roman Catholic, and confessed that all he knew of Christianity was that he had been sprinkled with water.

Another letter, written from Madras, in 1713, by the Rev. G. Lewis, throws a strong light upon the character of the non-caste Roman Catholics. He says: "For a little rice they will be of any religion, and for as small a consideration leave it again; and it is out of these that the Romish priests chiefly make their proselytes, whereby it comes to pass that the Christians in these countries are the scoundrel part of mankind; there is hardly a viler generation in the world, and a man had better have to do with an infidel, heathen, Turk, or anything than with them." In the book from which these extracts are made, "The Account of Ziegenbaljand Plutschan's Mission to Tranquebar," published in 1718, is a letter by a sea captain who had taken several Jesuits out to China, in which he urges the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge *not* to send any Portuguese Scriptures to China, because the copies would be collected by the Romish missionaries and burned. He related how Padre Tonglong, Prior of the Jesuits in China, assisted at a sacrifice to Confucius, and dipped his finger in the hog's blood that was sprinkled on the altar. When taxed about it, the Padre "answered like a Jesuit that though he assisted like a China Mandarin, he said the prayers of a Christian all the time of the ceremony."

This horrible system of deception and compromise worked its own destruction. In time of persecution the baptized heathen simply declared he was a heathen, and defied any one to prove the contrary. In the Tanjore persecutions of 1701 thousands of so-called Christians at once apostatized and saved their lives at the expense of their faith. And in the Mysore persecutions, when Tipû Sultan exported 30,000 Catholics, and compelled them to be circumcised and become Mohammedans, the Abbé Dubois makes the heart-breaking confession that out of 60,000 Catholics in the Mysore Province, not *one* had the courage to die for his religion. It was probably this painful experience that led this grand old missionary, in his later years, to declare that it was impossible for any Hindu ever to become a Christian.

It is to the credit of Pope Gregory that, when these converts numbered three millions, he discovered how vile and worthless they were. Following this discovery came the suppression of the Company of Jesuits as a mission agency in India. This is still regarded as an irreparable calamity. The fathers refused obedience to the papal decrees. Pope Clement called them "obstinate and impudent," and it was proved in 1734 that while the fathers in India vowed and swore on the Holy Gospels that they would obey the papal order, they yet perjured themselves by persisting in their former practices.

Père Thirion, writing on these Jesuit methods, says: "To understand the concessions made by the missionaries of former times to caste usages, reference is necessary to the different circumstances of time and place which rendered them legitimate. . . . If it was permissible to a philosopher to say, 'Perish the world for an idea,' still stronger reasons existed to justify the Pope and the missionaries in saying the same for the scrupulous maintenance of the ascertained faith of God." The ascertained faith of God was exchanged for a lie, and the pure practice of Christianity was subordinated to the hideous travesties of heathenism, and one feels that the summing up of the whole matter by that prince of missionary critics, Dr. Mullens, is true. "Of all misrepresentations of missionary labour theirs was the most awful; of all deliberate rejection of the Gospel, for heathen rules in preference, theirs was the most voluntary; of all the lying and perjury which have been committed by men of knowledge and education, theirs were the most deliberate, most unblushing, most continued, that the world ever saw. Such was, in deed and truth, the system of the famous Madura mission, a mission full of scandal. ous wickedness from its beginning to its end."

These are the gods of the modern missionary critic, and to their pattern every Protestant missionary must conform. To do otherwise were to commit the gravest sin. In 1675, at Dharm Apuri, in the Salem District, were two European priests. One was assigned exclusively to minister to the higher castes, and was called the "Priest of the Brahmins," while the other, called "Pandarani Swami, ministered to the pariahs of the neighbourhood." This was done, according to the naïve confession of the writer, "*so that caste prejudices might not stay the progress of conversions.*" Could the horrible system of compromise go further than it has in this stupendous hypocrisy? I well know that the critic, in his flippant, airy manner, will say in reply, "I only want you, the Protestant missionary, to imitate that which was good in the Jesuit, and to avoid his evil practices." I answer, show me the good and I will pursue it. I suspect it will take the critic all his time to do this, and even then, if he is an honest man, he will admit that the task is too much for him, and if your readers bring a candid mind to the consideration of the facts I have quoted—every one of which is capable of the fullest historical proof—then they will read another meaning into the much vaunted, but little understood, superiority of Jesuit methods.

II.—Modern.

Political events in Europe brought the work of Jesuit missions in India to an end. In 1759 Portugal broke up the Society of Jesus within its dominions, seized its property, and imprisoned its members. France did the same in 1764, and to put an end to its unspeakable scandals Pope Clement XIV., in 1773, was forced to suppress the whole society. These events deprived the Indian Jesuit missions both of priests and resources, and for a long time they languished. It is a strange comment upon the vaunted unity of the Roman Church and the co-unity of its various orders that during the period of the Jesuit decadence the Goa clergy seized upon many of the Jesuit churches, and quietly appropriated the property. The result is, that now the Archbishop of Goa claims jurisdiction over churches outside Portuguese territory. This has given rise to endless disputes and most costly litigation. In 1538 Gregory XVI. abolished four Indo-Portuguese Bishoprics in British India, and required the priests to take jurisdiction from the Vicars Apostolic. Those who refused are described in the earlier issues of the "Madras Catholic Directory" as "Schismatics." This went on till 1857, when the schism was healed by two priests being allowed to submit themselves to the authority of the Archbishop of Goa.

For sixty years after the suppression of the Jesuits their missions were simply allowed to get on as best they might. In 1830 a number of Catholics joined the Protestant missions, and then the Romish authorities took the alarm. The Propaganda was urged to send out Jesuits once more, and in 1837 the second Jesuit Crusade commenced. By 1847 sixty-four priests were at work in India. As a rule the new missionaries were all on fire with the newly-kindled enthusiasm for missions; they marched enormous distances in the scorching heat of the tropical sun, and cheerfully exposed themselves to the rigours of a life in the jungles, where malaria attacked them and they suffered no small peril from wild beasts. They slept upon the damp ground; curry and rice was their staple food. The result might have been foreseen; weakened by exposure and insufficient food, in less than ten years twenty-one young priests died. Some of them, while celebrating Mass, were seized with cholera at the altar. An English priest, brother of Lord Clifford, at this time insisted upon the priests having proper food and a moderate allowance of wine. They were properly lodged, and their comforts fixed at an irreducible minimum. This sensible policy justified its adoption, and from that time the mission has grown in usefulness and power.

It is no compliment to the Jesuits to say that among them are to be found some of the noblest missionaries of this or any age. But it is equally true that some of the Protestant societies have men who answer to the same description. One glaring misconception however must be set right I have never seen and never heard of any priest, Jesuit, or of any other order, who practised street preaching or bazaar preaching. I know three large districts well, which have about seventy priests distributed through them; I have never met one of these priests at work in the street. They do not even profess to do street preaching. As pastors in churches and teachers in schools they hold a foremost place, but one of them said not long since he did not believe in preaching to a crowd in a bazaar, because it was casting pearls before swine to do so. The method of street preaching among Jesuits simply does not exist. Dr. Murdock, perhaps the chief authority on Mission Economics now living, says, he "has never heard of out-door preaching to the heathen by Roman Catholic missionaries such as is common among Protestant missionaries." Dr. Murray Mitchell asserts, "I have never seen them preach in public." To these I could add scores of other testimonies.

In "Catholic Missions in India," the Rev. F. Louis St. Cyr describes the work of the priests: "The missioner's habitual life is to travel from village to village, to administer the Holy Sacrament to his people. . . . He is received with triumph by the assembled Christians, who come out to meet him with flags and native music, and conduct him to the church or chapel, where, after the first usual prayer, he announces to the people the length of his stay, the order of the prayers and duties of each day, and then gives them a fervent exhortation to profit by his presence, and approach the sacraments worthily. The following is the usual order of the day in a village visitation. At three in the afternoon the catechist assembles all who are preparing for the sacraments, and reads to them a preparation for confession, which explains the whole of the dogmatic belief, and also is mixed with fervent prayers to excite the necessary sentiments in the soul. The missionary then gives a public instruction, explaining the guilt of sin, and exhorting to contrition and amendment, and shows some striking pictures representing death, judgment, hell, and heaven, and the judgments of God upon sinners. . . . After this, "the confessions begin and continue often till midnight, to be renewed again in the earliest morning before Mass. At sunrise the bell rings to call all the people to Mass, and before it begins the catechist reads the prayers and instructions for Holy Communion, which are followed by an instruction from the priest himself. During the Holy Sacrifice the Acts of Faith, Hope, Charity, and Contrition are repeated aloud by the catechist, to prepare the people for receiving the body and blood of our Blessed Lord in Holy Communion." At 9 A.M. the priest takes his own meagre breakfast and says his prayers and office and rests a little. In the afternoon he is at the disposal of the people, settles their disputes, gives them help and advice, assists the sick and needy. In this way, fully employed, he spends a week or ten days in the village, and when the work is done the father goes to another to recommence the same labour.

Making allowance for the difference in order of service, mode of belief, and leaving out the music, I may say that the above description is also true of the Protestant itinerating missionary in India.

We may now ask what is the character of Roman Catholic Christians, and in what respects do they differ from their Hindu neighbours. It must be remembered that India is a slow-moving country, and ancient practices die hard. "Still in our ashes live their wonted fires," and the seed sown by the earlier Jesuits still brings forth fruit after its kind. The more respectable native Catholics observe caste. Pudupett, a district of Madras City, is almost entirely inhabited by this class, and in a stroll through it I have seen Saivaites and Vishnuvites wearing the distinguishing marks of their caste. The Saivaite who follows the "way of works," has on his sacred ashes and the pōtter, or circular dot, in the centre of his forehead. The Vishnuvite who practises the "way of faith," has his "namum," the trident-shaped mark of Vishnu, painted on his forehead. Round his shoulders is suspended the sacred thread. Outwardly I supposed these men to be respectable caste Hindus, but round the neck of some I saw small pictures of patron saints, and then I was informed that all the people were Roman Catholic, and, more than this, I ascertained that, after joining the Catholic Church, the converts were allowed to observe all the usages of the particular caste in which they were born. The blend is a curious mixture of Christianity and Hinduism. Thus, in their marriages the Christian part of the ceremony is celebrated in the church by the priest; the Hindu part is performed in the house of the contracting parties. The Hindu ceremonies last three days, and on the last day is the crowning ceremony of "Sheshai," in which a Brahmin priest pronounces Hindu prayers and scatters rice upon the bride and bridegroom. They have marriage processions through the streets with music and tom-toms. Another matter in which they closely resemble the Hindus is in their car festivals. Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and other saints are placed in the car, precisely as Hindu gods are placed, and the cars are dragged through the streets to the accompaniment of native, and sometimes English, music. The festival ends in a grand display of fireworks. I have seen a number of native Catholic churches, and in every one I have found caste distinctions are observed. One part of the church is rigdly marked off for the Brahmin and Sudra Catholics. There is another part for the outcast and pariah.

The non-caste Roman Catholic is left in a deplorable state of ignorance, and nothing is done to raise him in the social scale. It is this particular class from which domestic servants are largely recruited, and it has given to Indian Christianity a bad name. Hundreds of Anglo-Indians will tell you that they would not have a Christian servant upon any consideration. I had observed that these Catholics go to church only twice a year, on the great festivals of Christmas and Easter-day, the rest of the year seems to be an indulgence for them. The Protestant missionary cannot hope to compete with the Jesuit; the teaching of the one is as contrary to the teaching of the other, as light is contrary to darkness. The Jesuit uses means which the other cannot use, and while one strives by mechanical acts to add to the number on his church roll, it must be remembered that the other seeks to add to the kingdom of Christ purely awakened souls. Other means are employed of which I would briefly speak. It is a wise instruction of the society to which I belong, that a missionary shall have nothing to do with land. Thirty miles from where I am now writing is a Catholic village, and the priest living in it owns land to the value of sixteen thousand rupees. This land is let out in small allotments, and half the value of the crop goes to the man who tills the land and the other half goes to the priest. In another village where we had a small parish congregation, the people have been lost to us because they got into debt with the priest, and were compelled to go to his church. By this system of grants of land, money doles, gifts of cloth, many are gathered into the net of the church. I am bound to say, however, that the fathers of the Roman Church are, as a rule, very kind and inventively helpful to their people. I have had pleasant personal intercourse with some of them, and I cannot but admire their great self-denial, their unwearied persistency in work, their patient endurance of exile, which must be lonely to the last degree.

The reason of this paper will be apparent to most readers; the question all through has been, not men, but methods, and these two must still be kept apart. A Roman Catholic writer remarks: "The Jesuits have no happy hand," and it is instructive to note what they have not done. They have not given the Bible in any translation to their people. They have not kept clear and distinct the infinite difference which separates Christianity from Hinduism. They have not individualised the spiritual life of the native Catholic Christian; he still remains essentially gregarious in the habits of his church life, and trusts to the favourite saint of the greatest number for salvation rather than to the sacrifice of Christ.

The test of the value of methods is with some people the numerical result, but numbers here are fatally misleading. There is no true ratio, as Sir W. Hunter has demonstrated, between money spent and results gained on the mission field. There may, however, be a fair comparison as to the value of methods. Taking the Roman Catholic missions in India for the five years from 1880 to 1885, their rate of increase was 3½ per cent. per annum. Protestant missions during the same period and in the same country increased at the rate of 9 per cent. per annum.

It may be safely left to the Protestant missionaries to keep to their own well-tried methods; these are based on God's inimitable truth, and their success is so well assured that only the man who refuses to see it is the man who doubts it. Mr. Caine has made a mistake; let him have the candour to admit it, as he admitted his errors on the question of Home Rule. It is useless for him to try and square the facts of history with his theories of what things ought to be. We have to deal with things as they are, and it needs no prophet to foresee that soon India will be at the feet of Christ our Redeemer. By His help and blessing this blessed result will be found to have been brought about by faithful servants of His who practised the simple method which He taught them when He said, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

MOHAMMEDAN WOMEN.

BY MRS. ANNIE REICHARDT.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), June, 1891.

It is startling to any one who has lived in Mohammedan countries to know that here, in free, Christian, hitherto happy England, the dark shadow of the false prophet is finding a footing. Those who know the private, real, every-day life of the Mohammedan woman know also that her faults grow out of the system to which she belongs, which certainly does not hold up any high and noble aim for her to reach after.

It is a fundamental point of the Mohammedan religion that women should be secluded from and always veiled before strangers, and upon this axis their education turns. It is implanted into them with their mothers' milk.

I have seen many a bright little girl of two years old, riding astride on her mother's shoulder, her little fat rounded limbs in all their brown beauty, clothed only in a pair of anklets, a little sleeveless jacket reaching to the hips, and half a yard of muslin covering her head. One of the first things she is taught is to put up the little dimpled fingers and draw this bit of muslin across her face at the sight of a man, for whatever else a Mohammedan girl does not learn, she certainly does learn very perfectly the lesson that she must cover her *face* from the gaze of any strange man.

The Koran says, 'The women shall be unveiled only before their husbands, fathers, fathers-in-law, children, children of their husbands, brothers, and nephews.'

I will relate an instance of this which took place in Damascus, in a family with which I was well acquainted.

Latecfa Khanoom was the daughter of Z. Pasha. Her father was dead, and had died very soon after her birth, since which time she and her mother had lived in the house of Tewfik Bey. This latter had married Latecfa Khanoom's elder sister, and on the death of his father-in-law had taken the widow and the little Latecfa under his protection, treating them in every way as his own mother and sister. In fact, the little Latecfa was to him, as to her mother and sister, the petted and spoiled darling.

Djevdat Bey, a handsome young Turkish officer stationed at Damascus, wanting a wife, set to work to find out where he could meet with a Turkish girl of good birth, and through the usual means (the women who visit the different harems and report on the charms of the girls who are found there) he made his choice of Latecfa Khanoom. His proposals were accepted by the three persons who alone formed her family, being her mother, sister, and brother-in-law. She was barely twelve! As a matter of form her consent was asked, and having seen from the latticed window the suitor chosen for her, she made no objection but silently assented to become his wife. The ring and other presents sent by the bridegroom as sealing the contract arrived in due course, and with them the command to his bride-elect to veil herself, and keep her person sacred from the eyes of every man, even her brother-in-law, and never to remain for a single moment in the same room where he was. As a matter of course whenever the poor child was sitting with her mother and sister, and the step of Tewfik Bey was heard entering the house, she would scamper away (I have seen her do it often) and envelop her tiny figure in the voluminous folds of a large veil.

In another house, as I was sitting in the reception-room with the two ladies of the family, both of whom were exceedingly refined and courteous in their manners, all at once, to my great astonishment, one of them sprang up, and, throwing herself flat on the floor, pushed herself under the divan where I was sitting, while the other squeezed herself under a large oaken chest which stood in a dark corner and was raised a few inches from the floor.

A slight sound as of some one scraping his throat made me turn my eyes to the door. A very gentlemanly young man entered, salaamed, and, standing a little within the door, made some very courteous and polite speeches, carefully keeping his eyes away from the chest and from the floor near the divan; after which he again salaamed gracefully and left the room.

The two ladies then came out of their hiding-places, and, seeing my looks of surprise and bewilderment, laughingly told me that this young man was a younger brother of both their husbands (they were sisters-in-law), and that this business of hiding was so common to them, on account of the fact that no brother-in-law might look on their faces, that they thought nothing of it.

As there are instances of several brothers being in one family, and all living under one roof, the young wives must sometimes have very hard work to keep hidden.

However, no Moslem will go into any place where women are likely to be without giving some audible sign of his approach, nor enter a house without asking permission. Here again they have the Koran for an authority: 'Believers, enter not into the houses of other people unless ye are first permitted; and if ye are told to return, return, for it shall be better for you.'

When I lived in Cairo it was a matter of great amusement to me to hear our sakka (water-carrier), as he mounted our very long staircase (somewhere about a hundred steps), call out at almost every step, 'Dastoor!' 'Ya satir!' until he reached the top. I asked him once if calling out when he first began to ascend the stairs would not be sufficient. He said, 'No, for if by his negligence any woman should omit to veil herself or get out of his way, he might incur the guilt of seeing her without her veil, and it would be a heinous sin.'

Both men and women seem to have it ingrained in their nature that the more a woman hides herself so much the more is she worthy of the respect of man, and the more a man loves his wife the more secluded will he keep her.

For this various reasons are given. One man said to me, 'If you have a very valuable diamond or other gem of great price, you do not hang it up in the public streets where every passer-by can enjoy it and perhaps rob you of it. You hide it carefully away where even the sun may not look upon it, lest, perchance, its lustre may be dimmed; and that is the reason why we keep our "hareem" [they never use the word *wife*] carefully secluded.'

A more likely reason is the following, also given me by a Moslem: 'We are particular in insisting upon the women keeping themselves hidden or veiled, because in doing so they show a becoming respect for, and sensible appreciation of, man's position as being far above their own, and in neglecting to do it not only insult men, but themselves lose all claims to their own self-respect and the respect of men.'

Women are taught to believe that the highest term which can be applied to a husband's love is, 'He will not permit the sun to look upon her;' and to be proud when the seclusion in which they are placed is more rigid and rigorous than usual.

Woman is considered among the Moslems as solely a 'thing' to be married and become the mother of children! 'Her husband or her grave' is a common saying, meaning that a woman has no right to live except as a wife—that she can have no interests, no will, no thought, but to give satisfaction to the man who has conferred on her the honour of making her his wife. Thus for a woman to remain unmarried is a thing totally unheard of, she having no right or option in the matter.

Almost as soon as she can toddle about, her parents begin to lay by something towards her 'jehaz,' or outfit, as the word means, for her marriage, as if that was the one object of her existence, and she grows up even in childhood with that one fact held up before her. She has no happy childhood, no pretty dolls, no merry games, no brightly-coloured pictures. If her tender age should, in spite of all restriction, assert itself in some poor attempt at a frolic with a little brother or sister, or she is surprised into a faint semblance of light-hearted laughter or some burst of childish prattle, it is speedily quelled by a knock on the head and a push into a corner with the words, 'For shame! a girl should never speak unless spoken to; she should be seen and not heard; her mouth is given her to eat with, but not to talk.'

They are very rarely unmarried at sixteen, and I have seen many sad-looking little wives under ten!

A father has entire authority over his daughter, even to the taking away of her life if so it seems to him good, and no one may call his conduct in question! I do not say this from hearsay or from a wish to be sensational, but have myself actually known fearful instances of it.

If her father be dead, her brother is in the same position towards her, and when she is married her husband is her supreme lord and master. After the death of the latter, his son and hers becomes the arbitrator of her fate, thus verifying the saying common among them that a woman is three times a slave.

There are cases where a man may give his daughter in marriage to some one far beneath her in rank and position. This is often done by sultans, pashas, and very wealthy men, for in such instances the positions are reversed, and the wife can, and generally does, play the tyrant at will. Such a marriage is for motives of propriety and convenience, and the husband is made willing to play a very humble part in his wife's apartments. He cannot touch any of her property or sell any of her slaves, or even enter her own private suite of rooms if she is not in the humour to allow of it. But we are now speaking of the generality of Mohammedan women, whose lives are entirely the reverse of this, and what I want to show is that their lives, which I am sure no English woman need envy, are the natural outcome and fruit of that religion—that Koran—which is already bringing its baneful influences into England.

Four wives are allowed to every man, and as many concubines as he can buy and maintain. Their Koran tells them: 'Marry a second, and a third, and a fourth wife, but if ye find that ye cannot be just to more than one, transgress not the bounds of your ability. Of what you can buy, marry as many as you please.'

It is said by some that, as a matter of fact, the Moslem does not often marry more than one wife, and that there is much of domestic love, felicity, and peace frequently found in Mohammedan families. I repeat again, *it is said*, but I do not vouch for it, and, indeed, the Mohammedans themselves do not believe it. It is true that I have heard some of them say, 'It is much better to keep to one wife than to have the constant "bother" of the never ceasing quarrels in the harem when there are more than one,' and yet I have known those very men change their minds and bring in a younger and fresher face, notwithstanding the 'bother' and the extra expense it puts them to, excusing themselves on the ground that they only follow their apostle's example, and do what he gives them full permission for, in putting no limits to their desires.

The bringing in of a new wife is naturally the precursor to trouble and discord, and the divorce of the first one generally follows, unless the husband can afford more establishments than one. The reason of this is self-evident. The first wife, hitherto, and perhaps for many years, docile, obedient, and uncomplaining, sometimes even affectionate and devoted (I have known such cases), finding herself thrown off, uncared for, and compelled to become the servant and drudge of the new-comer, becomes restive, uncontrollable, and sometimes even fiendish in her disposition, and the husband having to choose between the tried partner of many years, and the fresh novelty, shows what he is made of by divorcing the first!

Thus it is a cruel irony to talk of conjugal love, of marriage felicity, among Moslems, whose very religion casts the poisoned shade of the upas tree on the holiest of all ties.

I have never forgiven myself for persuading a young Moslem maid of mine in Cairo to go back to her husband and continue to be an obedient, loving wife, notwithstanding previous cruelty and desertion on his part. She was a mere child in years—sixteen or seventeen—hardly more.

Poor Mabrooka! Those who talk and write so glibly of the 'laudable Moslem religion' ought to have seen this poor creature, as I told her that my religion taught me that it would be a sin on my part to keep her from her husband, and that she must try to forgive and forget, and go back and live with him.

She had been his wife for a couple or more of years, when he went away and left her with a young child in her arms—both wholly unprovided for! The infant died of starvation, and she was brought to me by the Sheikh El Mukhadameen (the chief of those who procure servants). She was very frightened when she came to me, for she had never spoken to Europeans, or indeed to Christians at all, and cried much the first few days; but it was a case of staying or going back to utter starvation. Good food had its due effect, and the fact that a young child very near the age of her own was to be her chief care soon reconciled her to living with me, child-mother though she was.

She was with me for eleven months. A more simple-hearted, docile, sweet-tempered creature I never had in my house. She was so attached to me and to my children that, as she was an orphan and had no relations, I hoped that I might be able to keep her always; but my wishes were frustrated. One day a Fellah was announced from Upper Egypt. It was her husband! He said he wanted his wife. Of course he had heard that she had been cared for and was looking well, and also that she had a nice little wardrobe, and a sum of money which in Cairo at that time was considered very substantial, and his fingers itched to have the despoiling of so many good things.

Mabrooka wept bitterly, and throwing herself at my feet begged me to keep her, saying she would be my slave all through life if I would only prevent her going back. We did all we could to persuade her husband to divorce her, promising him all her little possessions and a sum of money besides.

'She is my wife! I want my wife!' he kept on repeating doggedly, and I was obliged to make her go with him. With choking sobs and eyes filled with tears, she said: 'I will go, *ya sitti* (my lady), because you tell me that God and your religion say I must; but, oh! you do not know to what you send me!'

A few months after she came back, but so changed that it was difficult for me to recognise her. Cruelty and starvation had had their effect, and now he had again deserted her on the eve of again becoming a mother!

It may be said by Philo-Mohammedans, and I know it is said by Mohammedans themselves, that such things happen in Christian England. Yes! With grief and shame I grant it, but am thankful to add that the religion of Christian England does *not* abet or permit it, and this, thank God, makes a very wide difference.

One argument often brought forward by Philo-Mohammedans is that the marriage relation remains undissolved much oftener than otherwise. Such may be the case, for among the higher classes divorce is considered somewhat disreputable; not from any higher sense of its sinfulness, or any greater degree of affection on the husband's part, but because men of any position or standing are unwilling that their own particular daughter should have such a slight put upon them—that anything belonging to *them* should be obliged to submit to such a degradation at the bare caprice of another. Thus it happens that we never hear of the daughters of sultans, pashas, or any wealthy or influential people being divorced. I have heard it averred over and over again as a well-substantiated fact that the Sultan has at least one new wife every year besides innumerable concubines. What becomes of the old ones? Surely they must be divorced, for the law of El Islam will not permit of more than four wives, nor can a legally married wife become a concubine. There is therefore the always existing possibility of divorce for no reason at all, save a groundless and capricious whim on the part of the husband.

A Mohammedan girl is brought up with the idea that she has nothing to do with love. It is *ayib* (shame) for her to love her husband. She dares not do it if she would. What he asks and expects of her is to tremble before him and yield him unquestioning obedience. I have *seen* a husband look pleased and complacent when his wife looked afraid to lift up her eyes even when visitors were present.

Still, with all this, I have known of cases where the wife, being married young, and treated fairly well, really grew to love her husband, and I am sure it would oftener be the case but for the baneful effect of the example of their prophet and the permission of their Koran to bring in a second wife, or a 'white slave,' after a decade of years has passed away.

There are some men among them, but I think they are rare, who boast that they marry a new wife every month. 'It is so easy,' say they, 'to divorce a wife when one is tired of her!' And such is the fact! At any unexpected moment the fatal words, 'You are divorced,' may be uttered, and an utter wrenching of home ties, perhaps of many years' existence, takes place. The wife must veil herself, and never again let her husband see her. She takes with her any property that has been given to her by her husband, parents, or any other person, this being always entirely her own, and not in any way subject to her husband's will, and she leaves her husband's house, and her children.

A woman cannot, of herself, separate from her husband without his consent. If she is clever, however, she will take him by surprise at an unguarded moment, and contrive to do or say something which will make him so angry that before he can exercise sufficient self-control to stop himself, he has uttered the wished-for words.

Aysha, a servant of mine in Cairo, told me she had done it in this way. Her story was this. She was married at the age of nine years and grew up knowing no one and caring for no one but her husband. To see that his clothes were of a snowy whiteness, and his stews and pilaufs carefully cooked with the full modicum of rich spices and savoury herbs, the rice of a golden colour imparted by the saffron, and the meat of an appetising tenderness, and all ready prepared at the moment of his arrival from the sook, was the sole object of her existence, and she was contented and happy, for he always spoke as if he loved her, and said 'he would never marry again, but that she should be the companion of his whole life.' She was in time the mother of three children, who all died in infancy, but her life was bound up in her husband, and as long as she had him she did not care.

One day he came in bringing with him a little girl and said that he had married again!

'Ya Madamtee!' (Oh my misfortune!) screeched Aysha, who was herself barely twenty. 'What have I done that you should hate me all at once, and bring this strange woman between us? May your shadow never grow less; may your father find mercy; may you have length of days given you: send her back to her friends, and be not so cruel to me. Or else—why should I be in your way? divorce me since you no longer care for me.'

'No,' said her husband, 'I do not hate you, and will not divorce you. According to our prophet's words (on him be peace) we, the believers, may have more wives than one, and what you ask is impossible.'

The days went on, and Aysha found herself become the drudge and servant, and no appeals for divorce were listened to; so one day, just as it was about the usual time for him to come home, she got together all her things and put them behind the door, with her *milayeh* (large veil for covering the figure) and *boorka* (nose veil). She then set upon the new wife, beating her, and scratching her, and tearing out her hair at such a rate, that when her husband came in his rage knew no bounds and he screamed out, 'Talika bitalata!' (divorced the third time!) She had not been divorced before, but the phrase means divorced without hope of return.

In this way she got free, and catching up her bundle and veil with cat-like agility, she was out of the house before he could touch her.

This is one case out of thousands which are daily occurring, and proves what I said before, that it is the religion of the false prophet, the tenet of the Koran, to which are attributable all the faults of Mohammedan women. And can it be possible that the enlightened daughters of Christian England knowingly and willingly ally themselves to such a system by marriage with Mohammedans?

No amount of education or civilisation or public opinion can give the wife of a Mohammedan any security in the marriage tie.

Much has been said lately about the rights of woman. The gospel of Jesus Christ—the Old and New Covenant which form the basis of the religion of hitherto happy England—has given woman the right to be *queen* and sovereign of the home where she reigns as *wife*. As yet, and long may it remain so, her chief right and glory is to be the safe deposit of her husband's confidence, the guiding star of his existence, one 'in whom the heart of her husband doth safely trust, who openeth her mouth with wisdom, whose children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her.'

If things turn out otherwise—and it is sad that the weakness and sinfulness of human nature should often cause it to be so—yet it is not the Christian religion that is to blame.

I feel compelled to give one more example of what the Mohammedan can do, and what his religion sanctions.

It was a sad case which happened while I was at Damascus, and took place among the better class of Mohammedans.

Zeynab R. was married to a very wealthy man who was very much older than her father; but as he was of very high standing in Moslem society, her father congratulated himself on having secured him as a husband for his child. Zeynab was only about ten years old when she was taken to her husband's house, dressed out like a doll in all the finery and jewels which he had, in accordance with Moslem rules, sent with a lavish hand before the wedding.

Years passed away before she again crossed her husband's threshold.

Once behind the 'burdayeh' or 'starr' (for both these names are given to the thick heavy curtain which shuts out the women's apartments from the rest of the world) a young girl-wife is literally buried alive, and her horizon is limited by her husband, his wives, and his slaves.

Until she becomes a mother herself she may not even think of seeing her own mother, and if, as in the case of Zeynab, by means of wealth or position her husband stands a little higher than her friends, years may pass away before she crosses her mother's threshold again.

A harem is a world in itself. The husband is the autocrat, and the larger the amount of his wealth, so much larger his harem. What passes there is never known or commented on in the outer world.

It is contrary to all Moslem ideas and Moslem etiquette for any man to make inquiries about any female that lives in the house of another.

It is but natural to suppose that among the many human beings, wives, concubines, and slaves, who compose a harem—with the head eunuch, who ostentatiously keeps them in order, but is really a little king among them—there are strong wills and fierce passions, commanding intellects and unwearied energies, which, could they be rightly guided, might be of benefit to the world; but, being wholly without vent save among themselves, turn their little world into a perfect pandemonium.

I will not harrow the feelings of the reader by relating the cruelties perpetrated in the utter oblivion of the harem between themselves, as described to me by one of their own number, for they know that no law can reach them.

'Oh! it is only women among themselves—who can expect women to be reasonable? It is best to turn a deaf ear to what goes on in the women's apartments,' say the men with a contemptuous shrug of the shoulder.

The husband and autocrat, caring but for his own self-indulgence, one day lavishes caresses and loads with presents some, for the time, favoured one, and the next gives her up to all that the fury and jealousy of those who are less favoured can invent.

Zeynab became, in the course of time, the mother of two sons, but unkindness and cruelty had pulled down her constitution. Her mind seemed to give way at the hopelessness of her life. Worn to a shadow and mad with despair, she at last succeeded one day in eluding discovery by putting on the dress of a slave, and, slipping past the great burdayeh and the guardian *bowab* (the gatekeeper), fled to her father's house.

Her father had not seen her since she had left his house on her wedding day! True, rumours were whispered about, and had been brought to him by elderly women who frequent the harems as pedlars and hawkers, but he had shrugged his shoulders and merely said 'it would not be seemly to quarrel with a man of such standing as his son-in-law for the sake of a woman.' Now that he saw the change in her he was startled and shocked as she threw herself at his feet and begged him to put an end to her life if he would, but not to send her back.

The father's heart was awakened, and she was tenderly cared for, but a long and severe illness followed, in which all hope of life was given up by the doctors.

Her father took into consultation men learned in Moslem law, and sent deputation after deputation to his son-in-law entreating him to divorce her, and saying how utterly incapable she was of returning to be his wife. The unhappy father offered not only to remit her dowry and give up all claims to any property which she had left in the harem, but to pay any sum of money demanded within reason.

Again and again the same answer came back, 'I will not divorce her; she is my wife and must come back.' Cadis and moollahs were sent to expostulate with him, but he laughed at all they said. 'He wanted her back, sick or well, and he would have her; not because he loved her, but to show her the consequences of trying to escape him. He was a Moslem, and would brook no interference between himself and the inmates of his harem. Mashalla! They would laugh at his beard if they could get off so easily.'

His fiendish looks as he said this frightened even those hardened men, and they advised her father to keep her carefully hidden, lest she should fall a victim to her husband's cruelty.

Shall I—dare I—put on paper what his next message was? I did not see it done myself. I was told—yes, I was told on good authority and in bated whispers—what it was. He took her two sons, who were also his sons—those little darling boys—he took them, wrung their necks, and sent their dead bodies still palpitating to show her what he had in store for *her!*

The young mother, not yet twenty, never raised her head after the one wild shriek she gave, and in a few days she too died, the victim of despair.

This is no exaggerated tale, no piece of sensational fiction. If I dared give names and dates, I am not sure but what now at the present moment there are some in England who could corroborate my statement. But what need have I of witnesses? Every Moslem knows that his religion gives him supreme control in his harem, and that neither law nor public opinion can touch him there. I have known English women married to Moslems who, having in their own persons experienced the reality of such a life, have made it the one object of their lives to get their daughters out of the clutches of that religion, so baneful to women, before they reached the age considered marriageable among Moslems. I could call witnesses to the bitter tears and restless, sleepless anxiety with which an English mother watched the innocent gambols of her infant daughter, although her own husband was a man of education, of great wealth, and of a most influential position. He had been often in England and France, and spoke the languages of both those countries with ease. He was as good a husband as his religion would allow him to be, and after years of continued tears and entreaty on the part of his wife he actually was bold enough to wink at the mother's fleeing with the child to a place of refuge. For this amount of kindness he was called to account by the ulemas and learned men of his religion, on the plea that it was a heinous sin against the Koran to keep his daughter where she could not be married to a Moslem. He was ordered to command her return, but her mother hid her and changed her own name. This was some years ago, and I do not know what the sequel has been.

Having given an instance of a husband's cruelty as shielded by the Koran and the Mohammedan religion, I will now proceed to show how a naturally amiable and good-hearted man is bid to look upon his wife by the light of that same Koran.

On an Austrian steamer I met an Egyptian Effendi who seemed a man of intelligence and wealth. He had his wife with him, and had secured the ladies' cabin for her. There she remained with her three little children and a black slave, never coming out once for a breath of fresh air during the whole voyage.

The Effendi spoke of her in a very patronising, good-natured sort of way. He told me that he was just returning from Europe, and that, having been obliged to go there on business, he had taken his wife with him, to have an operation performed on her eyes for cataract, she being perfectly blind through that disease.

On my showing some surprise at his incurring so much trouble and expense for a wife, this being an uncommon thing for a Moslem to do, he said, 'It is *sowab* (a meritorious action) that she should be enabled to look upon her children. It is *sowab* with God. To see a blind dog who cannot look upon her puppies is a painful sight. How much more a human being! for *after all a woman is a human being.* But now that she can see them she has nothing more to wish for and is very grateful to me.'

All this and much more of the like nature was said with an air of great benevolence and condescension, and although he looked and spoke as if he knew that he had done a very praiseworthy and humane action, which showed the goodness of his nature, I was bound to give him his due. It was indeed, especially thirty years ago, a wonderful thing for a Moslem husband to do. Perhaps the fact that the three children were all boys had something to do with it, for most Moslems are very fond and proud of their sons.

It is said the Koran enjoins the kind treatment of the wife, and so it does after a fashion which yet clearly gives full license to the way the Moslems treat their wives. It says, 'Treat them kindly; and if ye would leave them, may God order it for the best.' 'If ye would change your wives for others, take not aught back from what ye had given them.'

This law demands no reason from the husband for divorcing his wife; nor does it give her any claim or legal power by which she may oppose his wishes in this respect; and it is in the selfishness of human nature that the strong shall triumph over the weak, and consider any and every exercise of power, however subtle or cruel it may be, as only the natural right and due given to man by God.

Man's will, capricious and fickle and totally unreasonable though it be, being made, therefore, the pivot on which these marriages rest, surely we know enough to be sure, in spite of all that Philo-Moslems may say, that the life of a Mohammedan woman is by no means to be envied.

Much has been written about 'woman's rights,' and 'women of to-day,' but the old words uttered thousands of years ago by our Saviour Himself, 'What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder,' have given woman her real status in this world. That she takes her place as a *helpmeet* to man she owes to the Christian religion; and never in the Moslem's Koran will she find such courage and strength as in the beautiful words, written by an inspired Apostle, 'Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it.'

THE REAL STATUS OF WOMEN IN ISLÂM.

BY THE HON. MR. JUSTICE AMEER ALI, CALCUTTA.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), September, 1891.

I HAVE read with some surprise the article by Mrs. Reichardt on Mohammedan Women in the June number of this Review. I should have thought that a Christian lady, and presumably an English woman, would speak with some reserve of a teacher who is regarded with veneration by forty millions of Her Majesty's subjects in the East, and would have the good taste not to offend their religious susceptibilities by the unnecessary use of mediæval vituperation. I am not concerned, however, with the manner of the writer's statements, but with the matter thereof. The standard of good taste is variable, and differs in each individual. Mrs. Reichardt has strung together a number of stories, partly ridiculous and partly disgusting, the scenes of which are laid in Syria and Egypt, where the lady seems to have resided, and upon the force of them she asks her readers to declare that the Islâmic system is a curse, and the status of women under it low. No doubt her manner of attack will to some extent answer its purpose, and create, or rather accentuate, the existing aversion to Islâm—an aversion which, fostered originally by designing ecclesiastics like Pope Gregory the Seventh, has existed in Christendom from the time of the Crusades.

Few of Mrs. Reichardt's readers will stop to consider whether her tales are genuine or probable—whether they have any bearing on the wider issue she has raised, namely, the comparative status of women under Islâm and Christianity—or to think that the same abuses which she recites as occurring in some Mohammedan families, exist sometimes in grosser form in Christian families. They will be carried away by the disgust of the moment. Some of her stories, instead of reflecting any discredit on the Mussulmans, to my philistine mind convey a decidedly favourable impression. For example, even Mrs. Reichardt may approve of the feeling (however ignorantly expressed) which actuated the water-carrier in giving a warning to her before entering her apartments. And I think that modesty, however exaggerated, is not out of place in this planet of ours.

As regards the other stories, I will not indulge in *tu quoques*. I shall not point to the tale told by the daily reports of trials in the police courts—a tale not dependent on the veracity of gossips or the colouring of missionary imagination—of parents maiming their offspring or beating them to death, of husbands trampling on their wives with hob-nailed boots, of the abominable brutalities inflicted on women and children by professed Christians; I shall not dwell upon the revelations in the divorce courts (not to refer to anything else), nor speak of the seething mass of immorality, depravity, and cruel heartlessness existing in the heart of Christian England. I would not be justified in pointing to the revolting sights one sees in the populous towns of Christendom as the outcome of Christianity. I would only ask Mrs. Reichardt to recognise that the crimes or the follies committed by Moslems may spring from other causes than their religion. Neither virtue nor vice is the peculiar property of any race or creed, and the lower nature of man will find expression in spite of the teachings of Christ or Mohammed.

The writer, however, is neither logical

nor historically correct in her exposition of the status of women in Islâm. She compares, albeit unconsciously, the status of an English woman in the year 1891 with a state of society in Syria and Egypt resembling more the conditions of life in Europe in the fifteenth century. But regarding this I shall have to say a few words later. Is she not aware that in many continental countries, in Russia specially, in the Spanish Colonies of South America, and in Mexico, the position of women is open to the same criticisms which she has levelled against the Syrian and Egyptian Moslems? Is it just or honest, by retailing stories. poured into willing ears, of possible and impossible incidents among semi-civilised people, to create a prejudice against all Moslems?

With these preliminary observations, I proceed to deal with the gist of Mrs. Reichardt's arguments. 'Upas-tree,' 'baleful influence,' and other such-like phrases apart, her indictment against Islâm, if I understand her rightly, resolves itself into four charges—viz. the seclusion of women and the low status assigned to them; the plurality of wives and the facility of divorce. It is the old oft-repeated story which has formed the burden of ecclesiastical attacks on Islâm for several centuries. Mrs. Reichardt takes credit to 'the Old and the New Covenant,' for the position which women now occupy in Christendom.

An examination of the position of women under what the writer calls the 'Old Covenant' will show how groundless that assertion is. The Hebrew maiden, even in her father's house, stood in the position of a servant; her father could sell her if a minor. In case of his death, the sons could dispose of her at their will and pleasure. The daughter inherited nothing, except when there were no male heirs. Marriages were invariably arranged by the parents, and wives were bought upon a recognised method of valuation. The Mosaic law set down the price at a uniform rate of 50 shekels—nearly 4*l.* sterling of English money—but it nevertheless varied in practice according to the station in life of the bride and bridegroom. Unrestrained polygamy was practised among all classes. Child-marriage was frequent, as it still is, among the Jews of Palestine. There was no limitation on the power of the husband to divorce the wife. It was sufficient 'to write a bill of divorcement' and dismiss the wife for no cause whatsoever: the wife having no power to divorce the husband nor to apply even to the judge to release her from an irksome bondage. This was the condition of women under the vaunted 'Old Covenant.'

Before I deal with their position under the 'New Covenant,' it may be as well to show what their condition was among the settled pagan Arabs, and in the neighbouring empire of Persia. Among the former, who were mostly influenced by the corrupt and effete civilisation of the neighbouring empires, a woman was considered a mere chattel; she formed an integral part of the estate of her husband or her father, and the widows of a man descended to his eldest son by right of inheritance, as any other portion of his patrimony. Hence the frequent unions between stepsons and mothers-in-law, which, when subsequently forbidden by Islâm, were branded under the name of *Nikâh-ul-Makt* ('shameful or odious marriages'). Even polyandry was practised by the half-Jewish, half-Sabāean tribes of Yemen, and female infanticide was common.

The corruptness of morals in Persia was fearful. There was no recognised law of marriage, or, if any existed, it was completely ignored. In the absence of any fixed rule in the Zend-Avesta as to the number of wives a man might possess, the Persians indulged in a multitude of regular matrimonial connections, besides having a number of concubines.

What did Christianity do to improve the position of women? It may be, as it is said, that Jesus mixed familiarly with women, and discoursed to them about His teachings. But of Christianity in its relation to womankind the less said the better. In the early ages, when the religion of the people, high and low, the ignorant and educated, consisted only of the adoration of the mother of Jesus, the Church of Christ had placed the sex under a ban. The 'Fathers of the Church' wrote upon the enormities of women, their evil tendencies, their inconceivable malignity; and Tertullian, that holy saint, described them as 'the devil's gateway, the unsealer of the forbidden tree, the deserter of the divine law, the destroyer of God's image—man.' And St. Chrysostom pronounced women to be a 'necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic peril, a deadly fascination, a painted ill.'

The Orthodox Church excluded women from the exercise of all but the lowliest religious functions. They were excluded absolutely from society, they were prohibited from appearing in public, from going to feasts or banquets. They were directed to *remain in seclusion,* to observe silence, to obey their husbands, and to apply themselves to weaving and spinning and cooking. If they ever went out they were to be clothed from head to foot. Such was the position of women in Christianity when Mariolatry was recognised and practised by all classes. In later times, and in the interval which elapsed between the overthrow of the Western Empire and the rise of modern society in Europe, a period which has been described as one of 'rapine, falsehood, tyranny, lust, and violence,' Christianity, by introducing convents and nunneries, in some respects improved the lot of women. But the convents were not always the haunts of virtue, nor the inculcation of celibacy the surest safeguard of chastity. The *Registrum Visitationum,* or the diary of the pastoral visits of Archbishop Rigaud, throws a peculiar light upon the state of morality and the position of the sex during the most glorious epoch of the Age of Faith. The rise of Protestantism made no difference in the status of women. Jesus had treated woman with humanity; his followers excluded her from justice.

The age of chivalry is generally supposed to extend from the beginning of the eighth to the close of the fourteenth century—a period, be it noted, almost synchronous with the Saracenic domination in Spain. During this period, in spite of the halo which poetry and romance have cast around the conditions of society, women were the frequent subjects of violence. Force and fraud were the distinguishing characteristics of the golden age of Christian chivalry. Polygamy was practised by all classes; morganatic and left-handed marriages were not confined to the aristocracy. Even the clergy, frequently forgetting their vows of celibacy, contracted more than one legal or illegal union. History proves conclusively that, until very recent times, polygamy was not considered so reprehensible as it is now. The German reformers, as Hallam points out, even so late as the sixteenth century, admitted the validity of a second or a third marriage contemporaneously with the first, in default of issue and other similar causes. Charlemagne, as is well known, had several wives.

Whether the unlicensed polyandry prevalent among certain classes in the West is preferable to the licensed polygamy practised by certain sections in the East, is a question on which I do not offer an opinion. Sufficient it is for me to say that the position of women under Christianity—until culture and progress in material development and humanitarian science called into existence that unwritten code of honour which is now in force among the *really* civilised communities of the West—the lot of Christian women was by no means so enviable as Mrs. Reichardt would fain make us believe. Under Justinian, the champion of orthodoxy, the streets of Constantinople were the scenes of the grossest and most revolting outrages. In the streets of Alexandria, a woman, whose only crimes were her beauty and her learning, was torn to pieces by the following of a Christian saint. Had St. Cyril written a book on women he would probably have agreed with the Hindoo legislator, Manu, who declared that a wife guilty of disobedience to her husband should be torn to pieces by wild dogs where the four highways meet. In mediæval times, women were outraged, carried into captivity, thrown into dungeons, scourged by the feudal chiefs of devoutly Christian Europe. They were burnt, they were drowned.

Mohammed appeared at this epoch. It was not his business to go about the countryside unhinging people's minds by announcing the immediate advent of 'the Kingdom of Heaven.' He applied himself to evolve order out of chaos. He had seen the immorality of the Syrian Christians; he had before his eyes the depravity of the settled Arabs and Jews. He restrained the power of divorce; practically forbade polygamy and concubinage, and placed women on a pedestal hardly approached (say what fanatics may) up to that time.

I have already shown the cruel powers possessed by the Hebrew husband under the 'Old Covenant' to divorce his defenceless wife. Among the Romans, the legality of the practice of divorce was recognised from the earliest times. The laws of the Twelve Tables admitted divorce; and if the Romans, as is stated by their admirers, did not take advantage of this law until five hundred years after the foundation of their city, it was not because they were more exemplary than other nations, but because the husband possessed the more cogent power of summarily putting his wife to death for acts like poisoning, drinking, and the substitution of a spurious child. But the wife had no right to sue for a divorce; and if she solicited separation her temerity made her liable to punishment. In the later republic, the frequency of divorce was at once the sign, the cause, and the consequence of the rapid depravation of morals.

'The ambiguous word which contains the precept of Jesus is flexible to any interpretation that the wisdom of the legislator can demand.' We may well suppose that at the time Jesus uttered the words, 'What God has joined, let no man put asunder,' he had no other idea than that of stemming the torrent of moral depravity, and he did not pause to consider the ultimate tendency of his words. The subsequent rule, which makes fornication (using the translated word) the only ground of valid divorce, shows how abundantly Jesus was alive to the emergency. But the 'wisdom' of later Christian legislators has not confined itself to a blind adherence to a precept laid down probably to suit the requirement of an embryonic community, and delivered verbally. The rule may be regarded as inculcating a noble sentiment; but that it should be considered as the typical law of divorce is sufficiently controverted by the multitudinous provisions of successive ages in Christian countries.

Two of the Christian Gospels make no mention of the reason for which Jesus allowed His followers 'to put away' their wives (Mark x. 11 and Luke xvi. 18). If the traditions recorded in these two Gospels be considered of higher authority than those passing under the name of Matthew, then one can easily perceive the force of what Selden says, that by an evasive answer Jesus wanted to avoid giving offence either to the school of Shammai or that of Hillel.

Among the pagan Arabs, the power of divorce possessed by the husband was unlimited. They recognised no rule of humanity or justice in the treatment of their wives. Such was the position of woman when Mohammed appeared. All his recorded sayings show that he looked upon the custom of divorce with extreme disapproval and considered its practice as calculated to undermine the foundations of society. He repeatedly declared that nothing pleased God more than the emancipation of slaves, and nothing displeased him more than divorce. It was impossible, however, under existing conditions to abolish the custom entirely. His mission was to mould the minds of an uncultured and semi-barbarous community to a higher development. The custom was interwoven with the habits of the people, and had become sanctified by the practice of ages; and accordingly he allowed the exercise of the power of divorce to husbands under stringent conditions. He permitted to divorced parties three distinct and separate periods within which they might endeavour to become reconciled and renew their conjugal intercourse; but should all attempts to become reconciled prove unsuccessful, then the third period, in which the final separation was declared to have arrived, supervened. In case of conjugal disputes, he advised reconciliation by means of arbiters chosen by the two disputants.

As usual, 'the Fathers of the Church' (and 'Fathers' are to be found in every church) have taken up the temporary permission as the positive rule, and ignored the principles of humanity, justice, and equity inculcated by the Master. I consider, however, that the rules laid down by them are far more humane and just towards women than those of the most perfect Roman law, developed in the bosom of the Christian Church. According to the Moslem legists, the wife also is entitled to demand a separation on the ground of ill-usage, want of proper maintenance, and various other causes, and the Kazi (the judge) is empowered to decree separation if the facts are established. In every case where the divorce orginates with the husband, he has to give up to the wife everything he settled upon her at her marriage. The frequent admonitions in the Koran against separations, the repeated recommendation to heal quarrels by private reconciliation, show how sacred the Arab legislator held the marriage tie:

> And if ye fear a breach between them (man and wife), then send a judge chosen from his family, and a judge chosen from her family, &c. &c.

Mrs. Reichardt says, as other Christian controversialists have said before, that Mohammed allowed his followers, besides the four legitimate wives, to take to themselves any number of female slaves. A simple statement of the regulation on this point will show at once how opposed this notion is to the true precepts of Islâm.

> Whoso among you hath not the means to marry a free believing woman, then let him marry such of your maid-servants whom your right hands possess and who are believers. This is allowed unto him among you who is afraid of committing sin; but if ye abstain from allying yourself with slaves it will be better for you.

Concubinage, the union of people standing to each other in the relation of master and slave, without the sanction of matrimony, existed among the Arabs, the Jews, the Christians, and all the other nations. The Prophet did not in the beginning denounce the custom, but towards the end of his career he expressly forbade it.

> And *you are permitted to marry* virtuous women who are believers, and virtuous women of those who have been given the scriptures before you, when you have provided them their portions, liv-

ing chastely with them without fornication, *and not taking concubines.*

How favourably does the tolerant spirit displayed in the first part of this commandment compare with the exclusiveness of Christian ecclesiasticism, which refused to recognise as valid or lawful the union of a Christian with a non-Christian, unless he happened to be a king! The stake was the lot of the 'infidel' who had the temerity to marry a *Christian!* Mohammed's rule, it must be admitted, was a distinct advance in humanity.

Now as regards polygamy, which is always cast into the teeth of Islâm by unthinking antagonists, Mohammed found it practised, not only among his own people, but amongst the people of the neighbouring countries, where it assumed some of its most frightful aspects. There was no limit to the number of wives a Jew or a Zoroastrian might marry; and in spite of the endeavour of Justinian to correct the evil, the case was the same with the Christians. Polygamy flourished unchecked among all classes of people, and the wretched women, with the exception of the first wife selected according to priority of time, laboured under severe disabilities.

Mohammed enforced as one of the essential teachings of his creed 'respect for women,' and his followers, in their love and reverence for his celebrated daughter, proclaimed her 'the Lady of Paradise,' as the representative of her sex. Our 'Lady of Light' is the embodiment of all that is ideal in womanhood—of all that is pure and true and holy in her sex. And she has been followed by a long succession of women, who have consecrated their sex by their virtues. Their noble lives and works have always furnished an example to the women of succeeding ages to venerate and follow.

'Paradise is at the feet of the mother,' said the Prophet of Islâm. This sweet and holy teaching which inculcates that love and devotion to the mother is the greatest act of piety, gives some idea of the high position which women occupy in Islâm. The Arabian Prophet prohibited the custom of conditional marriages, and, though at first temporary marriages were tacitly allowed, in the third year of the Hegira these also were forbidden. Mohammed secured to women, in his system, rights which they had not before possessed, and placed them on a footing of perfect equality with men in the exercise of all legal powers and functions. He restrained polygamy by limiting the maximum number of contemporaneous marriages, and by making *absolute equity towards all* obligatory on the man. It is worthy of note that the clause in the Koran which contains the permission to contract four contemporaneous marriages is made dependent upon the condition that the man is able to deal *equitably* and *justly* with all the four wives. The condition, therefore, cuts down the permission to its legitimate dimensions. The passage runs thus: 'You may marry two, three, or four wives, but not more.' The subsequent lines declare, 'but if you cannot deal equitably and justly with all, you *shall* marry only one.' The extreme importance of this proviso, bearing especially in mind the meaning which is attached to the word 'equity' (*adl*) in the Koranic teachings, has not been lost sight of by the great thinkers of the Moslem world.

Even so early as the third century of the Hegira, during the reign of Al-Mâmûn, the first Mutazalite doctors taught that the developed Koranic laws inculcated monogamy. And though the cruel persecutions of the mad bigot Mutaw-wakkil prevented the general diffusion of their teachings, the conviction is gradually forcing itself on all sides, in all advanced Moslem communities, that polygamy is as much opposed to the teachings of Mohammed as it is to the general progress of civilised society and true culture.

In India more than 95 per cent. of the Moslems are monogamists; in Persia 98 per cent., according to Colonel Macgregor's testimony. In Arabia and Turkey the practice of plurality of wives is confined to a very small class of people (compare Van Lennep and Niebuhr, both as worthy of credit as the authoress of the article under notice).

As regards divorce, speaking from a somewhat extensive experience of this province—which alone contains nearly twenty-two millions of Mussulmans—I know of only half-a-dozen cases occurring within the space of twenty-five years among the respectable classes—one of which, however, emanated from the wife. In all these cases there were faults on both sides. If the women nowadays have not the same facility as before for obtaining a divorce on the ground of ill-treatment, &c., the blame lies at other doors. Under the British rule, there seems to be no machinery for administering that branch of the Mohammedan law. In this respect, it must be said, the English in India have acted differently from the French in Algeria, who have maintained and improved the indigenous institutions. I hope, however, that the time is not far distant when the Moslems will prefer to follow the Prophet instead of the 'Fathers;' and will, in the absence of the Kazi, decide conjugal disputes by 'arbiters' instead of imitating the followers of the 'Old Covenant.'

The system of the seclusion of females where it exists among Moslems is a survival of an older growth. It had been in practice among most of the nations of antiquity from the earliest times. The gynaikonitis was a familiar institution among the Athenians; and the inmates of an Athenian *harem* were as jealously guarded from public gaze as the members of a Persian household then, or of an Indian household now. The gynaikonomoi, like his Oriental counterpart, was the faithful warder of female privacy, and rigorously watched over the ladies of Athens. The seclusion of women naturally gave birth to the caste of Hetairai, various members of whom played such an important part in Athenian history. Were it not for the extraordinary and almost inexplicable spectacle presented by the Byzantine Empire and modern Europe and America, I should have said that in every society at all advanced in the arts of civilised life, the growth of the unhappy class of beings whose existence is alike a reproach to humanity and a disgrace to civilisation was due to the withdrawal of women from the legitimate exercise of their ennobling, purifying, and humanising influence. The Babylonians, the Etruscans, the Athenians, and the pre-Islamite Meccans furnish the best exemplification of this view in ancient times.

The enormity of the social canker eating into the heart and poisoning the life-blood of nations in modern times is due, however, to the spread of a godless materialism covered with a thin veneer of religion, be it Christianity, be it Mohammedanism, or any other form of creed. Mohammed had, in early life, observed with pain and sorrow the terrible depravity prevailing among the Meccans, and he took the most effective step suited to the age and the people to stamp out the evil. Among the women of the Arabs fashion was as strong as in other ages and countries. It was the fashion among them to imitate the example of the Hetairai (*Kiyân*) and walk in the streets jingling their anklets with their bosoms half exposed. Those who have travelled in Upper Egypt or Lower Bengal will probably understand the immodesty to which I am referring. The Prophet of Islâm found the custom of seclusion of women existing among the Persians and other Oriental communities; he perceived its advantages, and it is possible that in view of the widespread laxity of morals among all classes of people, he recommended to women the observance of privacy. But to suppose for a moment that he ever intended his recommendation should assume its present inelastic form or that he ever allowed or enjoined the *seclusion* of women, is wholly opposed to the spirit of his reforms. The Koran itself affords no warrant for holding that the seclusion of women is a part of the new gospel.

> O Prophet! speak to thy wives and to thy daughters, and to the wives of the faithful, that they let their wrappers fall low.
>
> And speak to the believing women, that they refrain their looks and observe continence; and that they display not their ornaments except those which are external, and that they draw their kerchiefs over their bosoms.

The women were also enjoined not to take off their outer garments in the presence of any male except their fathers, husbands, or brothers. (This is supposed to mean unveiling themselves.)

The reasons for these directions are easy to understand in the midst of the social and moral chaos from which he was endeavouring, under God's guidance, to evolve order. They were wise and beneficent injunctions, having for their object the promotion of decency among women, the improvement of their dress and demeanour, and their protection from insult. It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose there is anything in the law which tends to the perpetuation of the custom. Considerable light is thrown on the lawgiver's recommendation for female privacy, by the remarkable immunity from restraint or seclusion which the members of his family always enjoyed. Ayesho, the daughter of Abû Bakr, who was married to Mohammed on Khadija's death, personally conducted the insurrectionary movement against Ali. She commanded her own troops at the famous 'Battle of the Camel.' Fâtima, 'our Lady of Light,' often took part in the discussions regarding the succession to the Caliphate, and her sermons, breathing that sweet nobility, that divine purity, which distinguished her character, are still extant. The grand-daughter of Mohammed, Zainab, the sister of Hussain, shielded her youthful nephew from the Ommeyodes after the butchery of Kerbela, and by her indomitable spirit awed the ferocious soldiery of Yezid.

According to Von Hammer,

> the *harem* is a sanctuary: it is prohibited to strangers, not because women are considered un-

worthy of confidence, but on account of the sacredness with which custom and manners invest them. The degree of reverence which is accorded to women throughout higher Asia and Europe (among Mohammedan communities) is a matter capable of the clearest demonstration.

Hamilton, the translator of the Hedâya, dealing with the chapter on Decorum, says, 'This seclusion is a result of *jealousy* or *pride*, and not of any legal *injunction*, as appears in this and several other parts of the Hedâya.' And Marsden, in his *Travels*, says, 'The Arab settlers in Java never observed the custom (of seclusion of women), and the Javanese Mussulman women enjoy the same amount of freedom as their Dutch sisters.'

In the early centuries of Islâm, almost until the extinction of the Saracenic empire in the East, women continued to occupy as exalted a position as in modern society. Zobeida, the wife of Hôrûn, plays a conspicuous part in the history of the age, and by her virtues, as well as by her accomplishments, leaves an honoured name to posterity. Humieda, the wife of Fârûk, a Medinite citizen, left for many years the sole guardian of her minor son, educates him to become one of the most distinguished jurisconsults of the day. Sukinah, or Sakina, the daughter of Hussain and the granddaughter of Ali, was the most brilliant, most accomplished, and most virtuous woman of her time—'la dame des dames de son temps, la plus belle, la plus gracieuse, la plus brillante de qualités,' as Perron calls her. Herself no mean scholar, she prized the converse of learned and pious people. Bûrân, the wife of the Caliph Mâmûn, Ummul-Fazl, Mâmûn's sister, married to the eighth Imâm of the house of Ali, Umm-i-Habil, Mâmûn's daughter, were all famous for their scholarship.

In the fifth century of the Hegira, the Sheikha Shuhda, designated *Fakhrunnissa* ('the glory of women'), lectured publicly at the Musjid-i-Jâma of Bagdad, to large audiences, on literature, rhetoric, and poetry. She occupies in the annals of Islâm a position of equality with the most distinguished *ulemas*. What would have befallen this lady had she flourished among the fellow-religionists of St. Cyril can be judged by the fate of Hypatia. Possibly she would not have been torn to pieces by enthusiastic Christians, but she would to a certainty have been burnt as a witch. Dzat-ul-Hemma, corrupted into Dzemma, 'the lion-heart,' the heroine of many battles, fought side by side with the bravest knights.

It is a calumny, therefore, to say that the Islâmic system has lowered the status of women. The Teacher who, in an age when no country, no system, no community gave any right to woman, maiden or married, mother or wife—who, in a country where the birth of a daughter was considered a calamity, secured to the sex rights which are only unwillingly and under pressure being conceded to them by the civilised nations in the nineteenth century—deserves the gratitude of humanity. If Mohammed had done nothing more, his claim to be a benefactor of mankind would have been indisputable. Even under the laws as they stand at present in the pages of the legists, the legal position of Moslem females may be said to compare favourably with that of European women. As long as a Mohammedan woman is unmarried she remains under the parental roof, and until she attains her majority she is to some extent under the control of the father or his representative. As soon, however, as she is of age, the law vests in her all the rights which belong to her as an independent human being. She is entitled to share in the inheritance of her parents along with her brothers, and, though the proportion is different, the distinction is founded on the relative position of brother and sister. A woman who is *sui juris* can under no circumstance be married without her own express consent, 'not even by the Sultan.' Centuries after this principle was laid down by the Moslem jurists the sovereigns and chiefs of Christendom were in the habit of forcibly marrying women to their subjects. On her marriage she does not lose her individuality. She does not cease to be a separate member of society. An ante-nuptial settlement by the husband in favour of the wife is a necessary condition, and on his failure to make a settlement the law presumes one in accordance with the social position of the wife. A Moslem marriage is a civil act needing no priest, requiring no ceremonial. The contract of marriage gives the man no power over the woman's person beyond what the law defines, and none whatever upon her goods and property. Her rights as a mother do not depend for their recognition upon the idiosyncrasies of individual judges. Her earnings acquired by her own exertions cannot be wasted by a prodigal husband, nor can she be ill-treated with impunity by one who is brutal. She acts, if *sui juris*, in all matters which relate to herself and her property in her own individual right, without the intervention of husband or father. She can sue her debtors in the open courts, without the necessity of joining a next friend or under cover of her husband's name. She continues to exercise, after she has passed from her father's house into her husband's home, all the rights which the law gives to men. All the privileges which belong to her as a woman and a wife are secured to her, not by the courtesies which 'come and go,' but by the actual text in the book of law. Taken as a whole, the legal status of a Mohammedan woman is not more unfavourable than that of many a European woman, whilst in many respects she occupies a decidedly better position.

Nineteen centuries of progressive development working with the legacy of a prior civilisation, under the most favourable racial and climatic conditions, have tended to place the women in certain parts of Europe and America on a higher social level than the men—have given birth to a code of etiquette which, at least ostensibly, recognises the right of women to higher social respect. And yet a great and civilised empire, the professed champion of Christianity, condemns women to the punishment of the lash and the outrages of fiendish guards in Siberian mines, and the people who wept so profusely over the wrongs of the Italian Poerio have not a tear for the miseries of these wretched women; they who went into hysterics over the myths wafted from Bulgaria to the shores of Great Britain have no word of reprobation for the sufferings of the women of a race to which belonged Mary and Magdalen!

If the Mohammedan women in the present day are not so advanced as their Christian sisters in the West, their backwardness is not due to the Koranic teachings, but to the general extinction among the Moslems of culture and progress under the avalanche of savagery which issued from the wilds of Tartary in the thirteenth century, overwhelming the whole of Western Asia with ruin and desolation. But if they do not in another hundred years attain to the social position of European women, there will be time enough to declaim against Islâm as a system and dispensation.

THE RIVAL "HOLY COATS."

From *The Church Times* (Ch. Eng.), London, August 21, 1891.

When the fanatical and extremely Ultramontanist Bishop Arnoldi of Trier exposed the "Holy Coat" for the veneration of the faithful in the year 1844, he had the grace to tell his flock that the authenticity of the ancient relic was no article of faith. It need hardly be said that the peasant pilgrims of Germany, Belgium, France, and other lands, who flocked day after day in their hundreds of thousands to Trier, paid more regard to the Bishop's action than to the Bishop's caution. They exalted the genuineness of the "Heilige Rock," the holy tunic, into an article of faith.

There are two ways of testing the authenticity of a relic. The Apostle's charge to "prove all things" is acknowledged as obligatory, both by the half-heathenish peasant and by the most scientific Catholic theologian. But by "proof" they understand two very different processes. The test of the one is, "Will the relic work a miracle?" The test of the other is, "What is the true witness of historical research as to this relic?" A sincere appeal to history can never be an attack upon the Catholic Church or Catholic doctrine; it is rather the only logical outcome of an acceptance of the great Vincentian canon of Catholicity. The Church has suffered cruelly from the imposition of false relics upon the veneration of the faithful. The Council of Saragossa in 592 had the courage to propose that the relics which were at that time brought in quantities from the East to the West should be tested by the ordeal of fire. At the beginning of the twelfth century two monks discovered in Jerusalem, and brought to Monte Cassino, a piece of the towel with which our Blessed Lord wiped the feet of His Apostles. It was cast into the fire, and at once took the colour of fire, but without losing its form or substance. When the fire had burned out, the towel was found to be intact. It must have been made of asbestos. The learned Professors Gildemeister and Von Sybel of Bonn in 1844 piously and bravely suggested that the "Holy Coat" of Trier should be subjected to a similar test by the ecclesiastical authorities as a canonical method for the removal of doubt from the minds of the faithful. It was early in the twelfth century that the famous Abbot Guibert of Nogent complained of the wholesale manufacture of spurious relics and spurious saints. He gave a series of examples from his own neighbourhood and his own experience. A young man in a village near Beauvais, he said, had been canonized simply because he died on Good Friday; the neighbouring peasants made pilgrimages to his grave, and offered candles and *ex voto* gifts in return for his intercession. "Through such lies and rogueries," said he, "purses are emptied to the very bottom. In towns and villages new saints are daily proclaimed, and the clergy hold their tongues." Guibert charged them with being afraid to defy public opinion, especially that of the old women who railed at them as irreligious if they ventured to contradict the local delusions. The worst of the clergy were tempted to trade upon the superstition of the faithful, and Guibert tells of one priest, "the preacher of a famous church, who exhibited a piece of bread which the Lord Christ had chewed with His own teeth." Guibert knew for a fact that one head of St. John the Baptist was to be seen at Constantinople, and another head of the same saint at St. Jean d'Angeli. He did not know, what is also true, that a reputed head of the Baptist was preserved in other places.

It was in this period of delusion and pious roguery, the beginning of the twelfth century, that "der heilige Rock," the Holy Coat of Christ without seam, was first declared to be in the possession of the Church of Trier. There was a common legend afloat in Europe in the twelfth century that a Christian Empress had brought or sent the seamless coat of our Blessed Lord from Jerusalem to Western Europe. According to the German variation, the Empress was Helena, who gave the precious relic to the Church of Trier. According to the French variation of the legend, the Empress was Irene, and she sent the Holy Coat as a present to the Emperor Charles the Great, who gave it to the Church of Argenteuil in France, where "la Sainte Robe sans couture de Notre Seigneur Jesu Christ" remains to this day, and is contended for by local patriotism as the actual tunic mentioned by the historians, Gregory of Tours and Fredegar. A romantic apologetic history of this French "Holy Coat" was published in the seventeenth century by Dom Gabriel Gerberon. The earliest documentary evidence of the existence of such a relic in Argenteuil occurs in the end of the twelfth century. The monastic church of Argenteuil, to which the French "Holy Coat" is reputed to have been originally given by Charles the Great, was plundered and burnt to the ground by the Normans in 845 or 846. Hence to account for the presence of the relic in the same place three hundred years later, it was necessary to invent the legend that the nuns of Argenteuil had time before their escape to have the French "Holy Coat" cemented up in one of the walls. The relic was discovered in this wall in the year 1150. The invention of the Holy Coat, as its historian says, was "the foundation of the rapid prosperity of Argenteuil. Pilgrims of every age, of every class in life, of both sexes, crowded to the place to venerate the sacred coat, and the monastery was enriched with donations and pious foundations." The authenticity of the French "Holy Coat" was vindicated by numerous miracles. In 1567 the monastery was again plundered and set on fire, not by the Normans, but by a Huguenot regiment. At this point the historians differ as to the fate of the relic. Collin de Plancy says that the impious Calvinist soldiery burned "cette robe sans couture," which we can readily believe, for the French Puritans doubtless regarded it as a "monument of superstition and idolatry," which the Lord required them to destroy. Nevertheless, the French "Holy Coat" appeared again in the beginning of our century. The Bishop of Versailles in 1804, at the order of the Cardinal Legate, instituted a formal examination of the genuineness of a much damaged "Holy Coat" which was dug up in the garden of the presbytery of Argenteuil, where it had been buried by the parish priest. The report was satisfactory. Pieces had been cut off for the use of pious persons during the long interval of the disappearance of the relic between the Reformation and Revolution. Several of these were collected. The old French "Fraternity of the Holy Seamless Coat" was reconstituted: the old "Litanies of the Holy Coat" were reprinted; medals were coined, and pictures published to quicken devotion to the "Holy Coat" in France. It was the suggestion of the mediæval Guibert, who could not forecast the ultimate political and ecclesiastical results, that every reputed local relic, like every reputed local saint, should not be reverenced as authentic until confirmation of its claims had been pronounced by the "Church of Rome," which came in time to mean, not the whole social body of the Roman Church, but simply the individual Roman Pope. In the year 1843 this much-desired apostolic confirmation of the genuineness of the French "Holy Coat," the most dangerous competitor of the German "Holy Coat" at Trier, was obtained from Pope Gregory XVI. He raised the altar of the parish church of Argenteuil, as "the altar of the Vestment, or Tunic of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is there deposited," to the dignity of a "privileged altar." We believe that several of our English Vaticanists, principally 'verts from the English Church, intend to go on pilgrimage to the German "Holy Coat" at Trier. If any one amongst them should be sceptical as to its being the only authentic seamless coat of the Saviour, he may be grateful to us for giving him the information that he can cite the authority of a Pope in justification of his doubts. Nay, a Roman Catholic of the old Vicar-apostolic epoch of English Romanism, and an ancestor of one of the present Bishops of the Roman Nonconformists in England, Lord Clifford, in the same year, 1843, published his "Brief Account of the Relic venerated as the Seamless Tunic of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is preserved in the parish church of Argenteuil."

Those Romanists who prefer to believe in the rival and more successful German "Holy Coat" at Trier can also appeal to Papal authority. They can cite Pope Leo X. against Pope Gregory XVI. When Popes differ, who shall decide? To appeal to a Council against a Pope, since the Vatican Council definitively substituted the individual person of the Roman Bishop for the social entirety of the Catholic Church, has become "treason" for the Roman Catholic. There is no question as to the difference in this case. On February 1, 1514, Pope Leo X. issued a Bull in which he said that the Cathedral Church of Trier was built by the Empress Helena, and that she caused the seamless coat of our Lord Jesus Christ to be placed in it. In "The History of the Holy Coat in the Cathedral Church of Trier," which was published by Dr. Marx, Professor at the Episcopal Seminary of Trier in 1844, with the approbation of Bishop Arnoldi, the bull of Leo X. is cited as a proof of the authenticity of the German "Holy Coat." Although there is documentary evidence, according to the two Bonn Professors, Gildemeister and Von Sybel, of the existence of no less than forty holy seamless coats of the Saviour, each of which in its time and place has been revered as the only genuine one, it is impossible for the simple Christian to believe that more than one of these can be genuine. King Edward the Confessor gave a part of the Holy Coat to Westminster Abbey. It is true that "Rome has spoken," but it is evident, since the Pope of the nineteenth century has virtually contradicted the Pope of the sixteenth century, that the voice of one or of the other, of Leo X. or Gregory XVI., cannot possibly be the voice of truth, or of Him Who is the Truth.

The London daily evening organ of the Pope and the Salvationist General has informed the world that "the Cathedral fathers at Trier invited a commission of connoisseurs to pronounce upon the garment," and that "an eminent German archæologist who was on this committee declared that part of the garment belonged to the dim and distant period when Cæsar Augustus ruled over the Roman Empire." The same pretence of satisfying doubts by submitting the relic to the examination of experts was gone through in 1844. But the experts were bound to a foregone conclusion. Unprejudiced archæologists who examined the Holy Seamless Coat of Trier discovered that it was very perceptibly seamed, and that figures of animals were discernible on it. Cordel, the Vicar-general of the diocese of Trier, at the exhuming of the Holy Coat in 1810, said that "the head of an animal was discovered on it," apparently a peacock, and he gave expression to the naïve wish "that fewer persons had been present, or else that the Holy Coat had not been exhibited in their presence." The two able historians and archæologists whom we have cited have produced exhaustive and incontrovertible evidence that the form, the colour, the structure, and the material of the woollen "Holy Coat" at Trier, apart from the total defect of historical testimony earlier than the twelfth century, all go to prove that it cannot possibly be the seamless coat worn by our Blessed Lord.

We began by referring to the difference in intellectual perception of the ignorant and the educated members of the Church. The peasant-class, which always supplies the greatest contingent of pilgrims, is inclined to attribute personality to the objects of its veneration. Eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses affirmed in 1844, in the German newspapers (we can give name and date if necessary), that the poor pilgrims cried out as they knelt before the relic, "Heiliger Rock, zu dir Komme ich! Heiliger Rock, dich bete ich an! Heiliger Rock, bitte für mich!" (Holy Coat, I come to thee! Holy Coat, I pray to thee! Holy Coat, pray for me.)

THE HOLY COAT.

From *The New York Freeman's Journal* (R. C.), August 29, 1891.

Berlin, Aug. 20.—The Holy Coat was exposed to view this morning in the Cathedral at Treves. Two Knights of Malta, in full costume, with drawn swords in their hands, stood on each side of the shrine inclosing the Holy Coat case, which was surrounded by tall lighted candles in handsome candlesticks, and surmounted by a large gold cross.

There was an impressive scene in the sanctuary. Over 100 priests assisted in the Pontifical High Mass which followed the unveiling of the coat. The Cathedral was richly decorated for the occasion, and was packed to the doors with people. The white surplices of the choir, the gorgeous vestments of the priests, the scarlet uniforms of the Knights of Malta, the countless lights flickering in every nook and corner, the prismatic rays filtering through the old windows, the strange congregation, composed of people of many nations and all walks of life, formed a picture not often seen.

Bishop Korum, in his address to the assembled multitude, earnestly urged the faithful to unite in venerating the garment from which power and virtue proceeds. The nave of the Cathedral was then cleared so as to enable the municipal authorities and the parochial societies to march up to the shrine of the Holy Coat and venerate that relic.

The scene in the Cathedral was a motley one. English tourists in light tweed suits, and Prussian officers in uniform, stubbornly refusing to kneel before the relic, and a bourgeois citizen in evening dress, were prominent in the crowd. The service, with the monotonous Gregorian chants, and the administration of the Eucharist to representative ecclesiastics, seemed of the character of a mediæval ceremony. The unveiling of the relic evidently made a deep devotional impression on the crowd of worshippers. Many were overpowered by their feelings. Several women fainted. There was a general movement of the crowd, prompted by curiosity as well as religious fervor.

The procession past the shrine of the pilgrims, most of whom handed a rosary or crucifix to attendant priests, for contact with the relic, was accompanied by a low hum of paternosters and aves. Among the pilgrims are aged cripples and sufferers from almost every complaint. Outside the Cathedral there was a busy scene, to which processions with banners and music, throngs of visitors and vendors of photographs, rosaries and images, who had a thriving trade, all contributed.

There were some scenes of disorder, owing to somewhat violent attempts made to gain early access to the Cathedral.

Treves is overflowing with pilgrims and with visitors whose curiosity alone has been excited. The streets are filled with processions of all descriptions, and sacred banners, torches and lighted candles are to be seen on all sides.

During the whole time the Holy Coat is on exhibition about twenty excursion trains a day will arrive at Treves, a very great number for a Continental city, and a large temporary railroad station has been built for the pilgrims. In order that the town may not be overcrowded, the different bands of pilgrims, led by their priests, will only be permitted to remain one night in town. Arriving, say, in the evening, they will march next morning in procession to the Cathedral, and must leave town the same evening in order to make way for other religious bodies.

Some idea of the number of people at Treves and of the accommodation provided for them may be had from the fact that nearly 500 citizens of Treves sent in petitions to the municipal authorities for licenses to keep inns and other public houses during the exhibition of the Holy Coat. In addition, nearly every private householder has made arrangements for receiving visitors during the six weeks of the exhibition. Extra horse-car lines have been laid, and a market will be held every day.

Pictures of the Holy Coat are to be seen not only in every shop window in Treves, but in nearly ever shop window of this city, and there are millions of these representations in all sizes and shapes, on handkerchiefs, on paper, on earthenware, on wood and on metal, which are being sold everywhere. The photographs are merely reproductions of drawings of the Holy Coat, published in illustrated papers in 1844, and there are also reproductions of medals of that time.

Much comment has been caused by the remarks of Bishop Korum in his opening address to-day, when he referred pointedly to the spiritual significance of the Holy Coat as being a seamless vesture and as being a symbol of the unity of the Catholic Church. There were many Roman Catholic members of the Reichstag present, and it is said that the Bishop particularly, and in a manner not to be mistaken, addressed his remarks to these members.

The Holy Coat is distinctly visible in the body of the Cathedral, and is much more plainly seen than upon the former occasion of its exhibition. The old silken covering, being almost entirely worn away, appeared to-day to be of a brownish-yellow color.

The first solemn exhibition of the Holy Coat took place in 1196, when it was placed under the new altar. There it rested until 1511, when the Emperor Maximilian I. urgently wished it to be exhibited, which was done in that year. Pope Leo X. about this time promised indulgence to all who made the pilgrimage to Treves. In the years 1531, 1545, 1553, 1585, 1594 and 1635 it was also shown.

Toward the end of the seventeenth century, when the French, under Louis XIV., invaded Germany, the precious relic was hidden in the fortress of Ehrenbreitstein. There, in 1725, the Elector of Cologne was allowed to see it. In Ehrenbreitstein the coat was kept until after the Seven Years' War. After the last exhibition there in 1765 it was brought back to Treves, but a few years later it had to be removed into the interior of Germany when Napoleon I. invaded the country.

At last, in 1810, another solemn exhibition could take place in Treves. Napoleon I. permitted it, but he expressly forbade miracles to be performed on this occasion. Yet the report of the Vicar-General, Cordol, about the exhibition says that gouty patients who were wheeled up walked away alone.

The rulers of 1844 were more tolerant, and therefore numerous miracles were reported. The Treves newspapers of that date are full of accounts of miracles which took place at the exhibition of 1844. The greatest sensation was caused by the healing of the young Countess of Droste-Vischering.

JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D.D.

BY THE RIGHT REV. HUGH MILLER THOMPSON, D.D., BISHOP OF MISSISSIPPI.

From *The Churchman* (Epis.), New York, September 5, 1891.

This evening *The Churchman* brings me the announcement of the death of my friend, John Henry Hopkins, and some well-considered words of its own in appreciation of his work, his influence, and his character.

The American Church is singularly unappreciative, even blind, one might say, to the power of her own periodical press, and to the work of its editors. She has no recognition ordinarily, no rewards certainly, for men who make, as you well say in Dr. Hopkins's case, eras in her history.

She seems to have a suspicion of men who write weekly for print instead of pulpit, who speak to an audience of twenty-five thousand thinkers, instead of to one of five hundred who do not think.

Nevertheless, she has produced two great editors, Dr. Seabury of *The Churchman*, Dr. Hopkins of the *Church Journal*, who each have created eras, who each have had more power in guiding her opinion and leading her steps, as far as human judgment can see, than any half dozen of her bishops or General Conventions.

The power is a tremendous one, and in both cases it was wielded (an irresponsible power, too, except to God and conscience) on high lines of duty, obligation, and Christian self-abnegation.

I knew personally both the men, honored and loved them both. The first only in his age, of course, and as I met him in his cloistered retirement, among his books in the General Seminary, where his successor should also have thought and written in the fallow leisure of his life.

Dr. Hopkins, I knew from the beginning. We were deacons together and I half-converted to his early fad of "perpetual deaconship" for example's sake!

I remember well the stimulus the *Church Journal* was to myself and others of my time—so long ago now!—and how delighted I was to meet the maker of it in the little dingy office in Cedar street.

He helped me, in sore need in my work, generously, and with a sort of boyish abandon. Indeed, he had the first characteristic of genius, he was a boy all the days of his life—fresh, unsophisticated, unworldly.

He preached the sermon at the consecration of the church his influence so largely helped me to build. He was godfather to my eldest son, at the first baptism had there. Went from New York to Wisconsin to do this kindness.

It came to us, in God's guiding of our lives, to stand opposed in crises of the Church's history. The friendship, the affection, were never touched. I wrote him once, at such a time, telling him I should in conscience oppose his views with all my power, but I wanted him to understand that nothing of that sort could change the deep regard I held for John Henry Hopkins.

His reply was characteristic: "You and I are too accustomed to square fighting to think the less of each other for a fair blow." He always fought with his visor up, a knightly opponent. There was no malice, no bitterness. Indeed, instead, a cheery boyish enjoyment of the intellectual fray.

Except Washburn, I never knew a man so incapable of understanding how an honest attack on his opinions could be construed into anything personal.

And now he is gone! And I cannot let his going pass without my humble tribute to a man dear to me, a friend to whom personally I owe much of what I have myself thought or said that may be of any worth, to a gentle soul, much misunderstood, as men of genius so often are, to a thinker who has left his mark for all time on the Church of his baptism, and to a Christian knight fallen with his armor on.

From *The Living Church* (Epis.), Chicago, August 29, 1891.

THE decease of the Rev. John Henry Hopkins, S.T.D., occurred on the evening of August 13th, at the residence of Dr. E. D. Ferguson, of Troy, N. Y., under whose friendly and professional care, Dr. Hopkins, as a cherished guest, passed most of the last years of his life. Born in 1820, in Pittsburgh, Pa., graduated at the University of Vermont in 1839, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1850, Dr. Hopkins has been identified with the theologic and liturgic development of the Church from the time of the Cary ordination, down to the anti-climacteric elevation of Dr. Brooks to the bishopric of Massachusetts. And here it should be said, parenthetically, was struck the first dissonant note in his entire ecclesiastical career, and this may be charitably attributed to the faltering, disordered judgment of a dying man.

From the outset, he became a Catholic, sincere, intrepid, aggressive, and thoroughly equipped for warfare, defensive and offensive; and withal, clothed upon with the rare grace of a fervent and abiding charity, which never chilled or failed in the crisis of most desperate controversies. His attitude was never apologetic or equivocal. *Sans peur sans reproche* he dealt the fiercest blows, and grappled with foemen of Catholic faith, wherever they were to be encountered, whether within the fold, or among the denominations, or the Romanists, without personal animosities, guiltless of unknightly behaviour, and never discomfited. He was a perfect controversialist, pushed to the front under emergencies that seized and dominated him from the outset. Thus he became a journalist, founding *The Church Journal* and conducting it for fifteen years, with such energy, signal ability, and devotion in the promulgation of Catholic Faith and Apostolic order, that he became their recognized champion throughout the American press; and to this day his reputation shines out chiefest and foremost among our defenders of the Faith.

Upon others, however, will devolve with greater fitness, due memorial survey of his valiant services for the furtherance and the maturity of the young American Church; as first to discuss in *The Church Journal*, and elsewhere, the introduction of the cathedral and see system; the subdivision and multiplication of dioceses; the sending forth of a pioneer episcopate for the opening up of new jurisdictions; a resuscitation of the Catholic theology of the Incarnation, with the ancient eucharistic worship of Catholic Christendom; the establishment of sisterhoods and brotherhoods under the ancient discipline for the furtherance of every good word and work; all this, and much more.

It is for us the rather to dwell upon his rare and gracious accomplishments, as they were lovingly devoted to the service of the Church. It will be generally conceded that in this relation he lived among us without a rival. His versatility was astonishing while his mastery was thorough, and at times brilliant. One of the original projectors and members of the old Ecclesiological Society, he early became a recognized authority through the entire range of its inquiries,—as to Gothic art in all its periods and phases and symbolism; sanctuary and chancel furnishings and adornments; sacred utensils and vessels, stained glass, interior decorations, mortuary and memorial art, and all the rest.

He was skilled in the arts of design; was more than an amateur painter in oils; with his brush, sharing the pious toils of his father, the Bishop, in more than one church and sanctuary. He was a curious and dainty master of poetic art, producing not a few carols and hymns which have promise of long life; while his knowledge in ecclesiastical music, especially in its earlier periods and schools, was recondite, and turned to excellent account, in the furtherance of Plain Song and Gregorian uses. The writer distinctly recalls the time when he had the privilege of introducing to the young seminarian "Helmore's (Plain Song) Psalter Noted," and the enthusiastic delight it elicited, an event more than once adverted to by the Doctor in after years, as his initiation into the fellowship of the true ecclesiastical school of liturgic music.

It was not alone his quick, keen intelligence in these multiplied arts of beauty;

since he at once set them at work,—placed them in current circulation throughout his constantly widening circle of influence, for he was a born propagandist of "The True, the Beautiful, and the Good," as expressed in ecclesiastical life and work. His linguistic acquirements were richly varied, and many translations of important papers and works, attest his acquaintance with modern as well as the classic languages. His "Life" of Bishop Hopkins is his *magnum opus*, followed by his editorial co-operation in the publication of the works and biographical sketch of Dr. Milo Mahan. Perhaps his most brilliant successes were editorial, and certainly as a journalist the Church has not as yet produced his peer.

No one can forget the singular energy and vitality of his English, at once Saxon, in its sharp, incisive directness; yet suffused with the finest graces of scholarship, in turn trenchant as the sword of Richard, yet subtle and deadly as scimitar of Saladin. He was almost fiercely in earnest: he knew exhaustively the bearings of questions in controversy: his memory was infallible, and so fertile and ready that no vulnerable point, or expedient of attack or defence escaped him. So his idiom became trained to its utmost possible efficiency, while intrepidity and adroitness made him the most formidable of recent controversialists. Moreover, there was the cheery humor of an imperturbable good temper, which never failed him; as on the platform of the Church Congress, where he was always among the most welcome in debate, or even in that most fierce conflict with the insolent Monsignor Capel. His persistence was splendid. He gave us no quarter and no rest in New York until its two dioceses had grown into five; and he was hammering away at some of these unwieldy jurisdictions for further division, when hand and voice were stayed by death. It was the same thing in Pennsylvania.

As a literary worker he was indefatigable, continuing at his self-appointed tasks, even until the end. His later contributions to *The Church Review*, quarterly, illustrate his unfailing ability and resources, as a theologian and defender of the Faith. Indeed, his latest volume, published by Mr. Thomas Whittaker, is one of the strongest contributions to our controversy with Romanism.

But who shall attempt to memorialize the depths and tenderness of his Christian charity, and his unostentatious charities, impoverishing himself his life long for the help and comfort of others! There are many to-day who must recall, with bitter sorrow, the departed priest who made haste to succor and vindicate the unfortunate and imperilled. In this Christ-like work he was busy in season and out of season. And so he lived and toiled, literally taking no thought of the morrow, for himself, until old age overtook him with shattered strength and worldly substance so lovingly dispensed, that the prosperous and self-seeking, who had taken the best of care for their own advancement and worldly gains, are half tempted to set him down as an improvident dreamer and an unpractical idealist.

That most unkindest cut of all, was the discomfiture that befell him, so near the close of his days, in the house of his life-long "friends," who shut the door of a limited professorship in the General Theological Seminary—and for which he was conspicuously qualified—squarely in his face. But no word of complaint is on record, as crossing his lips. While those who knew and loved him best, must agree that "these things are unequal," and cry out in their grief, "Alas! my brother!" they certainly will find joy in assurance of that exceeding recompense of reward in waiting for this good and faithful servant, now entered into rest with his Lord. Living without ecclesiastical preferment, and the distinction and emoluments that reward the ambitious and fortunate, no single, priestly life is interwoven more closely with all that is fairest and strongest in the Church life of this day, or has contributed more richly and lovingly for their growth and perpetuity. May he rest in peace, and perpetual light shine upon him!

PAROCHIAL *VS.* PUBLIC SCHOOLS —A SIGNIFICANT INCIDENT.

BY ALBERT SHAW, PH.D.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenom.), New York, September 12, 1891.

So much has been said and written of late concerning the growth of Catholic parochial schools in the Northwest, and their rivalry with the public schools, that very widespread interest can but attach to a recent step in the opposite direction—one that seems to possess unusual significance. At Faribault, Minn., the large Catholic schools of the Immaculate Conception parish have just been transferred to the local

Board of Education without any conditions or reservations; and the buildings were thrown open on Monday, August 31, for children of all creeds and races, under the direction of the public school authorities. The following letter, sent by the Rev. James J. Conry to the Board of Education, is the sole written instrument of transfer:

> FARIBAULT, August 26, 1891.
>
> *To the Board of Education of the City of Faribault:*
>
> GENTLEMEN—I have been informed by a member of your Board that you wished me to state definitely and in writing the proposition I submitted to you on the evening of the 22d inst., and to which you gave courteous attention. As an American interested in obtaining for the future citizens of the Republic the greatest advantages consistent with the common good, I beg leave to comply with your request, and again submit (this time in writing) the proposition submitted on the evening of August 22, 1891, repeating, with your permission, a few of the reasons at that time submitted therefor, viz.:
>
> That the children at present enrolled in the schools of the Immaculate Conception parish may receive the benefits that result from an American training in all that the term implies.
>
> That these children may thus receive in their civic training a perfect preparation for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship, thereby enhancing the renown of this city among its sister cities of the commonwealth as a great educational center; and that our custodians of the public schools may receive from State and county appropriations that additional per capita tax which the commonwealth wishes them to receive and which at present they fail to receive because of the maintenance of separate schools.
>
> I herewith subjoin the proposition: In consideration of one dollar ($1.00), I agree to place under the management and control of the Board of Education of the city of Faribault, the school building, and all its equipments, at present known as the parish school of the Immaculate Conception Church, with the grounds upon which the school building is located, the same to be used by said Board for educational purposes under such conditions as that Board may determine to be for the best interests of all concerned.
>
> Confidently intrusting the matter, gentlemen, to your discretion and judgment, I remain,
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> JAMES J. CONRY.

Father Conry's proposition was very fully discussed in all its bearings in two meetings of the Board of Education, and was unanimously adopted. There are, therefore, no longer any parochial schools in Faribault.

The town of Faribault is one of the most beautiful in the entire Northwest, and it is renowned as an educational center. Upon the slopes of the long east hill that overlooks the town in the valley is the series of institutions that have been built up as the "Seabury Mission," under Bishop Whipple's oversight—the famous Shattuck School, the Seabury Divinity School, and St. Mary's Hall. There also are the State institutions for the care and training of the deaf and dumb, the blind, and the feeble-minded. Faribault has a population of from seven to eight thousand, and it has the motley nationality complexion that one usually finds in the Northwestern towns. It has its strong contingents of Scandinavians, Germans, French-Canadians, and Bohemians. It has three Catholic churches, in charge respectively of a French, a German, and an American priest. Father Conry ministers to the American and Irish Catholics. He is himself Wisconsin-born, of Irish parentage. He is intensely American in his feelings and sympathies, and has somewhat recently gone to Faribault from St. Paul, where he was closely under the influence of Archbishop Ireland. However much his colleague the German priest at Faribault may have sympathized with his complete surrender to the public schools, it is likely that his action had the tacit approval of his French colleague, who is known to be a man of progressive views and American sentiments. It happened that the Catholic schools of Faribault were entirely grouped in one large building, and were under Father Conry's exclusive control; so that he was not obliged to defer to the foreign-speaking priests of the vicinity. His closing the parish schools practically compels the children of all nationalities to attend the public schools.

It should be observed that the School Board does not accept the parochial schools as such. The children who have heretofore attended them, from all parts of town, must now take their places among the other children of their immediate localities in the ward schools. Besides a central school which includes the high school, the public system of Faribault embraces six ward schools. The total number of pupils in the public schools last year approached 1,300; while there were several hundred in the Catholic parish school. The building now simply becomes available as an additional member of the public system, and its former character totally disappears. Since the Catholic children must be scattered throughout the school-rooms of eight buildings, it becomes manifestly impossible to retain the former Catholic teachers as instructors of Catholic youth. All such considerations were fully discussed, and perfectly understood by Father Conry.

Faribault has an admirable system of public schools, which for a number of years has been under the superintendence of Professor Willis West, a graduate of the University of Minnesota. Unquestionably their instruction and their general educational character is very far superior to that which pertained to the parish schools. Father Conry frankly recognized this fact. Also, and chiefly, as his letter fully implies, he recognizes the importance of the American public schools as the true nurseries of loyal and broad American citizenship.

Evidently he has no fear that the public schools will make Catholic children irreligious. He perceives, on the contrary, that it is the jealous and narrow attempt to educate Catholic children separately, and to keep them from contact with normal and heathful American influences, that most surely provokes a reaction and drives thousands of young people wholly away from the Church. Father Conry is fully aware that the public schools of Faribault are opened with the reading of a Psalm or brief portion of Scripture and with the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. But to such simple and unsectarian practice he makes no objection.

There can be no doubt whatever that this step has been taken with the sanction of Archbishop Ireland. That wise and patriotic prelate has an utter abhorrence of the foreignizing tendencies of the German, French, Polish, and Bohemian parish schools that are so numerous in Wisconsin and other Western States. He is in almost complete sympathy with the public school system as it stands, and is earnestly desirous to secure, upon what would seem to him a fair and honorable basis, a merging of the parochial into the public system. He must, therefore, be considered as authorizing the Faribault experiment.

There has been, of course, no transfer of the title of the Faribault school property; and it will be within the power of the Catholic Church to reopen separate schools at some future time in the existing building. But the Catholic laity of Faribault, now that the concession has been made by the clergy, will never willingly return to the plan of inferior Church schools, which they must support out of their private means, after having paid their share of taxes into the local and the State public school funds. Such steps once taken are not easy to retrace. And such examples are likely to prove contagious. The Faribault incident must, then, be regarded not only as remarkable in itself, but also as significant of yet more important things to come.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JULIUS KOESTLIN, AUTHOR OF THE LIFE OF LUTHER.

BY J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., BERLIN.

From *The Lutheran Observer* (General Synod, Lutheran), Philadelphia, August 28, 1891.

Dr. Julius Koestlin, professor of systematic theology in Halle, is now 65 years old. He was requested to furnish his autobiography for the series of *German Thinkers,* and his valuable contribution has just appeared. Koestlin has written on various theological subjects but is best known through his works on Luther. A large part of his life has been devoted to the study of Luther and the Reformation, and in this department he is, no doubt, the first living authority in the world. His work on the Life and Writings of Luther appeared in two volumes in 1875, and the third edition in 1883, the Luther year. Luther's Life in one volume, with illustrations, was published in 1882; the seventh edition in 1889. A still smaller biography for youth appeared in 1883; and within a year the twenty-second edition was published. Besides various addresses on the Reformer, he also wrote a defence of him against the attacks of Janssen, the ultramontane historian, who did his utmost to degrade Luther and the Reformation. Besides the article Luther in Herzog's Encyclopædia, he also published a work on Luther's Theology, and another on Luther's doctrine of the Church, not to name other writings bearing on similar subjects.

Koestlin's attention was directed to Luther's writings while still a youth for the sake of their style. When he entered the University of Tübingen, Professor Beck advised him to read Luther for the sake of his religious influence. Koestlin thinks it strange that this advice should come from Beck, regarded as heterodox by Lutherans, "and he was heterodox," he adds. Yet he remembers no other teacher in his whole life who referred him to the study of Luther's works for the sake of their religious influence. Indeed, Koestlin had to learn that many glory in being Lutherans who care far more for their fixed and finished views than for the spirit and works of the Reformer. Thus in his work on Luther's Theology he brought out much that was new; but the new points were not further developed and did not even excite comment. The author adds: "A peculiar sign of those times, in which so many wanted to be regarded as true Lutherans and strove to appear interested in Luther's doctrine."

The immense labor devoted to the large Luther biography was rewarded by the reception given the work. No scholar arose to dispute his conception of the Reformer, and the work itself became the inspiration for renewed study of the great revival of the sixteenth century and for new works on the subject. An historical prize given once in ten years was shared by Koestlin for his book with Ranke, the greatest historian of the age. The Prussian government also put Koestlin on a committee to superintend the publication of a critical edition of all the works of Luther.

Koestlin has not only made a study of Luther and the Reformation as no other theologian, but he is also an avowed Lutheran. This term is not used in the same sense by those who make the name a boast and the means of parade : but he uses it with a full knowledge of its import and on account of the valuable treasures restored by the Reformer. We therefore turn with peculiar interest to his views of matters pertaining to Lutheranism.

He visited Scotland while a student for the purpose of studying its religious condition. Scotch Presbyterianism had much that was inspiring, nevertheless he found it too narrow, too legal. Yet he discovered genuine catholicity there, and a great admiration for Luther. When he told the Scotch pastors that he came from Würtemberg (his home then being in Stuttgart), they understood him to mean Wittenberg, and would at once exclaim : "Ah, the town of Luther!" He was struck with the fact that at the great Luther celebration at Wittenberg, in 1883, there were representatives of the Scotch and Irish Presbyterian churches to join in the Jubilee. But the Anglican church was not only not represented, but, he says, there were persons in that church who proposed a counter-demonstration. It is well-known that the High-church party rejects the terms Evangelical and Protestant, and glories in the name Catholic, and that from its midst are heard denunciations of Luther and the Reformation which are worthy of the ultramontanes. This party rejects the place which Luther gave the sermon in worship, and substitutes for it the Prayer Book and Romish practices.

After his extensive journeys for religious study in Scotland, Ireland, England, Germany, and Switzerland, he became *Repetent*, or tutor, in Tübingen. He says that then he felt the need of forming a clear conception of the Evangelical and Lutheran view of the church. "I became absorbed by Luther's own doctrine. I found it neither so difficult nor so unsettled as I had heretofore heard from others, nor yet the same as the teaching of the older and newer dogmaticians ; neither did I find it in harmony with the views prevailing among churchmen of the present, who on the one hand expect too much from liturgical formulas, and on the other look for a special blessing from the episcopal form of government."

From Tübingen he went to Göttingen as professor of theology and second university preacher. Professor Schoeberlein, greatly intent on developing liturgies, was called to the university at the same time. From the meagre liturgical services of Würtemberg Koestlin was now introduced to the much more elaborate forms of worship prevalent in the kingdom of Hanover. But efforts were inaugurated to make the liturgy more elaborate. This Koestlin vigorously opposed. He says : "It may be a defect arising from my antecedents and churchly training, but although I have learned more and more to prize this side of divine service, I never yet have acquired enough taste and enthusiasm for it. But I was firmly convinced, and am still, that for the quickening of the congregation the most beautiful hymns and responses that are put into the mouths of the people, are less effective than the impulses given them to be active in works of Christian love, as inner missions and the like, and to take part in all the management and government of the church. As a student of Luther I also believe it my duty to utter a warning, in my small book on Luther's Doctrine of the Church, against the dangerous modern overestimate of those (liturgical) elements. At least it seemed to me that the forms of the various churches which had become historic should be treated with the greatest consideration, and ought not be changed without urgent reason, and especially not without the consent of those participating in the service." When Schoeberlein, therefore, wanted to make the liturgy more elaborate, Koestlin answered "No."

He was decidedly opposed to the use of all constraint respecting the worship of congregations. From Göttingen he went as professor to Breslau. While there, it became his duty to visit a congregation to induce them to accept a new hymn book. The congregation declined doing so ; and he declared publicly and officially that a congregation cannot be forced to change its hymn book. And this declaration he made respecting a congregation which belonged to the state church. He also had serious doubts about the introduction of two books, with many hymns alike, into the same church. His mission to the congregation was a failure, and the authorities of the state church yielded the point in favor of the freedom of the congregation.

Koestlin repeatedly shows his antipathy to the high church Lutheran tendencies, which he had frequent opportunities to study. At Breslau he came in contact with the separatistic Lutheran movement. This he could not favor, just as he felt repelled by the coldness of rationalism and the perversions of ultramontanism. He knew Luther too well to be carried along by the numerous modern perversions which seek their power and glory in the abuse of the Lutheran name.

After visiting Great Britain, while yet a student, he came to Berlin. Here he met, among others, the devout Gossner. At that time an especial effort was made for the promotion of what is called "New Lutheranism" in Germany, while in America it is called "Old Lutheranism." The extremes then advocated (it was in 1850) have since been pushed aside by a deeper and healthier Lutheran spirit. But to the statements of Koestlin, "It was at a time when in Berlin especially, even among honest Christians, a sickly union of politics and religion, a blind return to old dogmatic forms, a vain longing for high churchism and for external authority, threatened evangelical Christianity with the most serious dangers, and also found pernicious expression in many pulpits." In opposition to this, Gossner, on New Year's day, 1850, basing his remarks on Lamentations iii. 9, made this appeal to his hearers: "Do not complain of the democrats, do not murmur on account of revolutionists, but complain of yourselves and of the state of your heart!" In Gossner's prayer was included a petition for deliverance from a churchliness and an orthodoxy behind which lurks the devil.

Koestlin earnestly advocates a living faith. He regards Christian faith as an inner experience, a response of the soul to divine influence. Genuine faith leads to communion with God through Christ. With this view of faith he could agree neither with rationalism nor with a faith which needs external human authority for its validity. During his stay at Breslau he found a rationalism prevalent in Silesia which fails to recognize the proper foundations of Christian faith. He also found there a churchly orthodoxy which had inner warmth, but which also rejected, by means of superficial apologetics, the just demands of criticism, and "boasted of a faithful adherence to the Lutheran confession, without a thorough knowledge of Luther."

The author is still in full vigor, and much may yet be expected from his earnest labors. He combines heart with intellect, theology with religion, a critical with a devout spirit, a scientific mind with a sincere love for the practical work of the church, and an appreciation of the historic development with a keen sense for the demands of the present.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION IN NEW YORK CITY.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN J. STEVENSON, PH.D.

From *The New York Observer* (Undenom.), September 10, 1891.

Our city congregations have been modelled after the country parish—a model which answered fairly well fifty years ago, when men lived near their work and within five or ten minutes' walk of their churches. But New York is no longer the huge village of fifty years ago; the change began in 1850 and it has been increasing rapidly since the close of the Civil War. Prior to 1860, business life here was thought intense; it is vastly more intense now. The hours of daily toil have been shortened, it is true, but at a great cost to the worker, for more work is done in less time and the struggle for place is severer each year. An immense foreign population has been unloaded on us; the agricultural population of the whole country has been sending sons and daughters to live here in boarding houses while struggling for fame or fortune.

Religious organizations have been affected with the rest; the old type of organization, the solid family church, is almost a memory. In the middle wards on the west side, churches are merely ways along which or through which crowds go as they would follow a business street. Even the churches in Harlem tell the same story. Apartment and boarding houses are everywhere, and many large congregations have little more of real existence than the cloud banner on a mountain peak. The form is constant, but the material is ever changing. This floating material has "sampled" the various pastors of the region and it demands a high type of pulpit eloquence, while at the same time, conscious of more than its value, it demands much individual attention from the pastor. Formerly church machinery was simple—a Sabbath-school and a Ladies' Missionary Society practically comprehended all, so that the pastors and session easily kept track of everything and guided it. Now the kinds of work are legion, and the hold upon them is very slender.

The change in church conditions came so gradually that full recognition of it was too late for our half-manned churches to protect themselves. Family clusters disappeared slowly and the unsettled floating groups came in not much more rapidly. The newcomers were restless, capable of doing an enormous amount of good work, if well directed ; of doing a vast amount of injury, if ill-directed or left alone. Pastors accustomed to the old methods and to the old type of people failed to adjust themselves completely to the new conditions, despite their most faithful efforts. The sessions, composed of busy men, living far away from their business and too often far away from the church, ignorant of the changing conditions or ignoring them, could render little assistance ; at best, the elders could give to religious work only of the hours devoted by others to recreation or to personal improvement. They could hardly undertake to organize and to manage detailed work in directions enough to prevent restless people from wasting their energies and doing injury to the congregation. When earnest men planned new work or desired to introduce methods not tested by experience, assent rather than consent was given by pastor and elders, who required as the only condition an acknowledgment of session's right of control. From small beginnings there has grown up in and around our churches a host of religious and semi-religious voluntary associations, often receiving money by church collections, making free use of the church buildings for various purposes from popular lectures down to Mrs. Jarley's waxworks, yet so nearly independent that any interference by session would be regarded as impertinent meddling and would lead to difficulty in the congregation. Too frequently even the Sabbath-school is a voluntary association, so that, though it is supported by church collections, its teachers would resent as simply outrageous any proposition that the session should appoint the superintendent or should demand a thorough accounting for expenditure of funds. Teaching in Sabbath-school or the performance of any work appears to be regarded by many as a courtesy whereby the pastor and session are placed under obligations. The rage for office holding and for absolute individual freedom makes almost necessary a regular organization with full staff of officers for each kind of work.

A store, in which each buyer runs his department without reference to the rest, feeling that his is so far the most important that he must get the lion's share of the capital without being called to account for method or expenditure, would be an object of ridicule. Yet this is practically the condition in congregations where voluntary associations of all sorts from King's Daughters down to lodges of Sons of Temperance clamor for the use of the church buildings. The only reason for existence of the congregation, as understood by many workers, is to provide money for their especial hobby, which is vastly more important than saving souls by any Scripture method. Regular church work is, for many, secondary, while that of the incidental concerns is all-important. Voluntary societies absorb a great part of the energy ; a part of what remains finds its way into the Sabbath school—with what effect can be ascertained by examining the report of Presbytery's committee on Sabbath-school work.

A return to system is needed. Church buildings and church members must be regarded as simply so much capital to be put out at usury ; to do this well we must return to Presbyterian order. The session is the responsible head, to which belongs the oversight of every organization within the congregation or making use of its property.

But the pastor and session cannot attend to the details of church work as it is today ; they may plan, they may raise money and they may do other work, but there is a limit to their capabilities as men—and in New York, that limit is reached very soon. Few sessions in this city can hold their meetings in the afternoon ; comparatively few sessions are represented steadily by ruling elders at the afternoon meetings of Presbytery. If the details of the work are to be cared for properly, clearly congregations must cease their dependence on voluntary assistance in responsible positions ; the work must be done by men whose sole business it is ; there must be assistant pastors, holding a position of responsibility to the session through the pastor. A congregation with a shrewd, energetic pastor, who does not fear to preach the message with which Paul startled Felix, and provided with two or three efficient clerical assistants, aided by as many women to act as Bible readers, would do untold good anywhere in New York.

For it is not necessary to confine this mode of operations to down-town and east-side wards, where the City Missions has tested well a plan very closely akin to it; not even to the 9th, 15th, 16th, and 20th wards, which have so many apartment and boarding houses; it will answer well anywhere, because it will lead to work for every one in the congregation. A Young Men's Christian Association, a Young Women's Association, modelled in purpose after the larger organizations, should be connected with the church, but each should be under a delegated head, one of the assistant pastors, who would follow a definite plan accepted by the session. Other work would be found and plenty of it; it could be systematized and kept fully under control. All members of the congregation would be kept busy and the devil would have little opportunity to work ill. Strikes rarely occur in good times when all are under contract; so in church work; only during sluggish periods do voluntary societies rise to weaken church work and to prove a bane to the pastor.

A congregation thus organized should concentrate its efforts. Instead of planting mission stations in contracted or uninviting buildings, such as preclude hopes of their growing into congregations needing only help and not support, the staff of workers should be utilized near the church or at least within reach of it. The people would be kept in touch with the work and, more important still, with each other. When the vicinity ceases to afford work for all, then will be the time to begin mission work at a distance; and when begun, that work should be solely with the aim of making, as soon as possible, a church similar to the parent.

It is said again and again that not every church is able to support a staff of assistant pastors, and many think this is a final argument. But just here is the place for Dr. Schauffler's clean cut statement, so well put in the *City Mission Monthly* two or three months ago: Have fewer congregations, and so diminish the cost of administration; that is, have less money sunk in real estate, need less fuel and light, have fewer sextons, organists, and the rest. Business men appreciate this. When there are too many in one line they tire of competition, they unite, reduce expenses, pay their honest debts, and make a decent living in addition. Common sense should prevail equally in church work; it would prevail if our sense of spiritual need were as positive as that of bodily need. By combination diminish the number of churches striving to "make ends meet," and therefore in competition. The new church, in each case, will be self-respecting; it will have a strong body of people and means sufficient to sustain a corps of salaried workers, who will discover methods of keeping the members employed. Such a church would soon exhaust its neighborhood, and be compelled to seek an additional outlet for energy. It would be like a regiment properly officered; whereas many an ordinary congregation is hardly better than some of the volunteer regiments at the beginning of the war, provided with an educated colonel, and with wholly untrained but thoroughly self-satisfied officers of lower grades. Surely a well-manned church is no dream; Dr. Rainsford and Dr. Mottet have proved that. Theirs are working churches; the doors are not kept closed during six days each week; they endeavor to give the community something in return for freedom from taxation.

It is said too that it is impossible to secure elders of the right stamp, men who act as faithfully as directors of banks and railroads are familiarly supposed to do. Any such assertion as this is a reflection upon the intelligence and Christianity of Presbyterians; it is closely related to the lament that the Westminster catechisms cannot be taught in mission Sabbath-schools. The catechisms, both larger and shorter, can be taught, are taught to mission children wherever the teacher honestly desires to teach them. In like manner, elders of the right stamp can be found or trained where they are needed. Men to do the work well will be discovered without difficulty as soon as the eldership ceases to be a nominal affair or a merely ornamental appendage.

There is, however, one serious difficulty in the way, which must be removed before this plan can be fully carried out in New York City. The congregations will refuse to unite; and congregationalism has a hold so strong that Presbytery would hesitate long before taking any positive step toward the amalgamation of two congregations. This, however, is no reason for refusing to study and to discuss the question. It is the strongest proof that a wide discussion is needed. Certainly the only hope for Presbyterianism in this city is in a return to Presbyterian methods and the consequent systematizing of the work. To bring this about, little is needed beyond a persistent presentation of the condition, so that our people may be informed. Presbyterians are set in their ways; but their characteristics are those of the great Teuton race, among whom self has always been subordinated to the common weal; their reason convinced, they are ready for self denial everywhere.

THE TROUBLES IN CHINA.

BY A. P. HAPPER, D.D.

From *The Independent* (Undenom.), New York, September 10, 1891.

The extent of the troubles in China and the serious nature of this outbreak of popular violence are very imperfectly understood. China is so different from other countries, and people here are so little acquainted with its condition and character and the position of foreigners in that country, that it is difficult for people to get clear ideas of the matter. A few preliminary statements will help many to appreciate the state of things in that land.

The geography of the country is very different from that of the United States. The rivers run nearly all from the west toward the east, emptying into the Pacific Ocean. As a general remark the country may be divided into three natural divisions. The southern division is bounded on the north by a continuation of the Himalaya range of mountains. It is drained by rivers flowing from the west, north and east and emptying into the ocean a little southeast of the city of Canton. The middle division is the great valley of the Yangtsze River. It is one of the great valleys of the world. It extends from the east to the west, some 1,800 miles, and from south to the north from 600 to 800 miles. The Yangtsze, rising in the extreme west, flows through the whole length of the valley. It is joined in its course by rivers as large as the Ohio and the Arkansas as they flow into the Mississippi. It also, about the middle of its career, receives the waters from the largest lakes in the country, so that the valley is everywhere well watered and has easy communication by navigable streams to all ports. It has a population of 150,000,000, and there are many and large cities and towns on the banks of its rivers.

The third division is that part of the country which lies between the northern boundary of the valley of the Yangtsze and the great wall of China, which runs from the east to the west on the north. The capital of the Empire, Peking, is less than one hundred miles from the northern boundary, and eighty miles southeast from Peking is Tientsin, its principal seaport.

By the treaties which have been made between China and Western nations within the last fifty years, some twenty-two cities in different parts of the country are open to the residence of foreigners for trade and commerce. These cities are styled treaty ports. Besides these, in accordance with a stipulation made in the 6th article of the French Treaty of 1860, "missionaries are permitted to rent and purchase land in all the provinces, and to erect buildings thereon at pleasure." In accordance with this stipulation, missionaries, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, are residing in many cities and towns which are not treaty ports.

In the absence of any specific census of the foreign population of all classes resident in China, it is safe to state that there are more than 7,000 foreigners resident in China. Of these more than 1,300 are adult Protestant missionaries. As 391 of these are married, 700 will be a low estimate for children; which will make the number of the missionaries and their families to be 2,000. The number of European priests connected with the Roman Catholic missions must be near 1,000. The property belonging to the foreign residents in China will amount to nearly $100,000,000. The commerce of China, which is principally conducted by foreign merchants, amounts yearly to more than $200,000,000.

The right to reside in China and engage in all lawful pursuits is secured to citizens of all Western nations by treaties of peace and friendship between China and all these Western nations, duly ratified and exchanged. There are ministers from Western Powers resident at Peking, and China is represented by her ministers in Western lands.

In the treaties of most of the Western Powers there is a special article in reference to Christianity, and those who profess its doctrines. Article VIII of the English treaty, made in 1858, reads thus:

> "The Christian religion, as professed by Protestants or Roman Catholics, inculcates the practice of virtue, and teaches man to do as he would be done by. Persons teaching it or professing it shall alike be entitled to the protection of the Chinese authorities; nor shall any such, peaceably pursuing their calling and not offending the laws, be persecuted or interfered with."

The articles in the French, the Russian, and the American treaties, referring to Christianity, are of the same tenor. The French treaty, in Article XIII, is more full and explicit, and says:

> "The members of all Christian communions shall have entire security for their persons, their properties, and the free exercise of their religious services; and an effective protection shall be given to missionaries who go peaceably into the interior of the country, furnished with passports as provided for in Article VIII."

In Article VI of the supplementary treaty of 1860 is the stipulation about "renting or purchasing land in *all the provinces*," as quoted above.

It was regarded by all Christians as a very gracious Providence that toleration and protection were secured to Christianity in so populous a country by these treaties of four great Western Powers. It was followed by a great increase in the number of missionaries of all communions. The Chinese Government have to a good degree fulfilled their treaty obligation up to this time except in the year 1870. On the 21st of June, 1870, at the treaty port of Tientsin, within eighty miles of Peking, a riot, participated in by tens of thousands, occurred, resulting in the destruction of the French Cathedral and Orphanage, and the massacre of *twenty* French and Russian subjects. The American Minister, Mr. Low, in a dispatch of June 27th to his Government in reference to this terrible outbreak of popular violence, which threatened the lives of all foreigners in the north of China, states the case as follows, viz.:

> "At many of the principal places in China open to foreign residence, the Sisters of Charity have established institutions, each of which appears to combine in itself a foundling hospital and an orphan asylum. Finding that the Chinese were averse to placing children in their charge, the managers of these institutions offered a certain sum per head for all the children placed under their control; it being understood that a child once in their asylum, no parent, relation or guardian could claim, or exercise any control over it. It has been, for some time, asserted by the Chinese, and believed by the non-Catholic foreigners residing here, that the system of paying bounties induced the kidnapping of children for these institutions for the sake of the reward. It is also asserted that the Priests or Sisters, or both, have been in the habit of holding out inducements to have children brought to them in the last stages of illness, for the purpose of being baptized '*in articulo mortis*.' In this way many children have been taken to these institutions in the last stages of disease, baptized there, and taken away dead. All these acts, together with the secrecy and seclusion, which appear to be a part and parcel of the regulations which govern institutions of this character everywhere, have created suspicions in the minds of the Chinese; and these suspicions have engendered an *intense hatred* against the Sisters on the part of all the common people who live near a mission: and any rumor concerning the Sisters, or their acts, however improbable or absurd, found thousands of willing and honest believers among the ignorant and superstitious people. Some time about the end of May, or beginning of June, an epidemic prevailed at the Sisters' Institution at Tientsin, and a considerable number of the children died. In some way the report got abroad that the Sisters were killing the children to get their eyes and hearts for the purpose of manufacturing some sort of a medical specific much sought for in Europe and commanding a fabulous price." —Williams, "Middle Kingdom," Second Edition, Vol. II, pp. 760-761.

These rumors excited such a frenzy that led it to the results above stated. The ministers of Western nations at Peking presented a joint note to the Chinese Government for vigorous measures to protect the foreigners and punish the rioters. Prince Kung, the head of the Regency, replied on June 25th "that high officers had already been directed to do everything in their power to suppress the spirit of riot and arrest lawless men." In a few weeks the naval forces of the leading powers in the Eastern Seas had assembled at Tientsin to enforce their demands. The Chinese Government sent a high officer to France to placate the French Emperor and avert a war with France. When the disasters of the war with Germany came the matter was settled by the payment of $560,000 as an indemnity to the families of those murdered, and for the property destroyed.

But this recent outbreak has occurred in the populous valley of the Yangtsze. Instead of being confined to one city, as in the previous one, it has spread to all the cities where foreigners are on both sides of the river, viz., Yang Chow, Wuhu, Ngan King, Tan Yang, Wuseuh, Haiwen, Soo Chow, Tsung King, Chin Kiang, Kiu Kiang, Wusieh (where three English ladies and four children were in great danger, and two Englishmen who went to their rescue were killed), and Tchang.

The *danger* threatened all the foreign residents in the Yangtsze Valley, so that the naval vessels of all Western Powers in those waters, as well as those of the Chinese Government, were summoned to their protection. The male residents at Hankow, Kiu Kiang, Wuhu, Chinkiang and Shanghai organized volunteer companies, and armed themselves under Consular supervision to defend their families and property.

This outbreak has occurred most unexpectedly to all the residents in China, both native and foreign. Various causes have been suggested for the outbreak, and different purposes have been surmised as actuating those who have excited it. But while various opinions are held and expressed as to the purposes and designs of those who have stirred up the outbreak, there is a general agreement as to *the means* they have used to excite the populace to commit these deeds of violence and plunder. It has been by the circulation of the same kind of rumors that were circulated in Tientsin, twenty-one years ago, viz., that children were killed to get different parts of their bodies with which to make medicine. Every means were used to confirm the widespread and prevailing belief of this calumny. At Kuhu, where the destruction of property was first made, it is stated by a writer in the North China *Herald,* of May 15th :

> "The trouble at Wuhu appears to have had its origin in the stock story of taking out the eyes of children at the Roman Catholic orphanages."

After getting possession of the place they proceeded to take up some of the dead bodies and exhibit the mutilated remains. At other places they took up the bodies of children and showed that the eyes had been taken out. Of the riot at Kiukiang, a writer in the North China *Herald,* of June 12th says: "As usual, they made 'the children' the occasion of the outbreak." At Wusueh, twenty-five miles above Kiukiang, where there is no orphanage, and where the two Englishmen were killed, the populace were excited to deeds of murder and arson, by persons carrying through the streets a basket containing four infants which they said were being taken to the orphanage at Kiukiang. Another writer, in the North China *Herald,* of July 10th, says :

> "The recent riots in the different cities have been incited by inflammatory reports of murdered babies and human remains being divested of eyes and internal organs for medicines."

It may be stated in explanation of the fact that this calumny of taking the eyes and internal organs of children with which to make medicine, should so suddenly excite the people at each of these places, that during the last twenty-one years a little book in Chinese has been widely and persistently distributed, in which these statements are made. The book has been translated into English by the Rev. John L. Nevius, D.D., of Chefuh, and bears the title, "The Deathblow to Corrupt Doctrine." Christianity is referred to as the corrupt doctrine. The common people are pervaded with this belief, and the evil disposed persons have used this as the means of arousing them to an intense excitement, and who can be surprised at the terrible results.

I purposely refrain from expressing any opinion on the purposes or plans of those who have stirred up this sedition, because I do not know what they are. The thing which, in my judgment, requires the careful consideration of all men, is this : What can be done to prevent the recurrence of a similar outbreak in the future ? There is the general concurrence of all the writers on the outbreak that it is the reception of so many children in orphanages, and the consequent death of so many children, that has been used to excite the populace to these fearful outbreaks, leading to such serious and widespread consequences. Under these circumstances, it would occur to most persons that the most obvious thing to be done is to discontinue that part of mission work which is so offensive to the people and which gives occasion to such results. The propriety of this action is confirmed by the expressed desire of high officers of the Chinese Government to that effect. The viceroy of the two Lake Provinces on the Yangtsze, Chang Chih-tung, who is the ablest officer next to Li Hung Chang, when taking prompt measures to restrain the populace, "has advised the missionaries to give up collecting orphans for the present." He thus shows his opinion as to the occasion of the outbreak, and what is necessary to prevent its recurrence.

In the year 1870, after the terrible massacre at Tientsin, the Chinese Government presented to the ministers of the Western Powers at Peking certain things from which missionaries were to refrain, in order to prevent a recurrence of the outbreak of violence. The first thing referred to was this, the missionaries were to cease receiving the Chinese children into orphanages. The matter was expressed by the Chinese very diplomatically, thus : "That *only* the children of *native* Christians be received into Roman Catholic orphanages."

Most persons would suppose that such a reasonable and obvious requirement would be at once complied with ; but no attention was given to it, and the fearful calamities of May and June, 1891, have occurred. As these calamities have been so widespread, and affected the interests and subjects of all Western Powers, and the peaceful relations of so many nations with China, it has become a matter of *international impor-*

tance, and should become a matter of diplomatic conference and action.

It is an obvious truth that no class of persons may pursue a course of action which not only endangers themselves, but also endangers the lives and property of whole communities. The baptism of dying infants and the reception of infants into orphanages are not such *integral* and *essential* methods of missionary work that they may not be properly intermitted as a *matter of expediency.* The fact that the propagation and professing of Christianity has already become the subject of negotiations between China and Western Powers, and that the articles in the treaties of the several Western nations in reference thereto have been accepted and acted upon by "all the Christian communions" laboring in China, properly brings this matter under diplomatic consideration. It may be supposed that now, in view of the deplorable results, there will be an immediate willingness of the Roman Catholic communion to accede to this reasonable request of the Chinese officials. If they do not then it would appear that it may be presented to the consideration of the Pope of Rome that he may give the necessary instruction to the missionaries of that communion in this matter—the Pope has for these 250 years claimed and exercised the prerogative of commanding and directing the Roman Catholic missionaries how they should carry on their work in China. Within the last ten years the Chinese Government has negotiated with the Pope of Rome as to the exchange of the site of a cathedral in Peking for another site which is not open to any objection. Two hundred years ago it was frequently a matter of consideration in the Roman Consistory as to what terms should be used to express the name of God in Chinese, and what rites connected with native customs should be permitted to native Christians in China. So there is abundant precedent for referring the matter of receiving the children of others besides those of the native Christians in orphanages to the Pope of Rome for consideration and adjudication. All lovers of peace and concord—among the nations of the earth—and all who are interested in the progress of missions in China will hope that the advisers of the Chinese people will help them to this desirable result.

It becomes a necessity that some method may be devised that will relieve the difficulty in regard to missionary work. It never can be successfully prosecuted under the protecton of gunboats.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE HERESY-HUNTER.

BY THE REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenom.), New York, September 19, 1891.

"And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch!"—Mark xiii. 37.

THE obligation of vigilance is universal; is vigilance always a virtue? Everything depends on the spirit in which the watching is done. What is the motive of your vigilance? What are you watching for? It is the reporter's business to keep his eyes and ears open—but for what? For virtuous or for vicious deeds? For the things that make for the edification of society, or for the things that make for its destruction? For the fragrance of moral loveliness, or the stench of moral carrion? What are his senses trained to detect? The answers to this question will determine whether he is a public benefactor or a public nuisance. The senses can be trained as well as the muscles. The telegrapher stands talking with you in the deafening clatter of the instruments round about him; you distinguish nothing; but he is reading off a clear message from some sounder near by; his ear is trained to gather these articulate words out of all this noise. The eye sees what it is trained to see; the ear hears what it is trained to hear; the olfactories catch the odors on which they are intent. Our watching is not, therefore, an instinctive process; it is a function which may be educated; and the question whether our vigilance is profitable can be answered only by carefully investigating the objects upon which it is directed. It may be of infinite advantage to us if we watch for the right things and watch in the right places and with the right motive; and it may be of infinite injury to us if the reverse of all this is true.

In his lectures on "The Influence of Jesus," Dr. Phillips Brooks makes the following statement, which will aid us in the discriminations now before us:

"The sin with which Jesus was always upbraiding the Pharisees—what he called hypocrisy—is at once a spiritual and an intellectual vice. It was a disbelief of the greatness of God which made it possible for them to dream of imposing upon him. It was a pride in themselves which could not look into the vastness of truth. The unbelief which Jesus upbraids is not the doubt of special doctrine, but that narrow and worldly temper to which the whole world of mystery was inconceivable. The doubter whom Christ rebukes is not the earnest and eager believer who has become lost in the highways of faith. It is the unventuresome spirit which is incapable of faith at all which has reduced the world to materialism, like the Sadducee, or made duty into law and religion into ceremony like the Pharisee. For neither of them was there any outlook. For his disciples, the word of intellectual life as of moral discipline was, 'Watch. Expect new things. The world is large. Out of the darkness shall come light. Be ready for surprises.' Such readiness is the rightful possession only of men who live not in the forms but in the principles of things; and so the spiritual thoroughness into which Jesus led his disciples is bound up closely with the intellectual progress which they attained."

These words of deepest insight discover to us the true posture of Christian faith, and the temper of a kind of unbelief which always exists, and which is the more fatal to all religious advancement because it supposes itself to be, and proclaims itself to be, the only genuine faith. "That unventuresome spirit which is incapable of faith at all," which has "made duty into law and religion into ceremony" or dogma, to which there is no outlook, for which there is no expectation—that spirit is always sure to vaunt itself as the exponent and custodian of the faith. It always has done so since the days of the Pharisees; it always will do so till the millennium. The people to whom there is no open vision, the people whose religion rests wholly upon a fixed routine or a stereotyped symbol, are the people who always establish themselves as the managers and leaders of the sects; their mission is not to assist, but to hinder, the development of the religious life of the Church. With those who try to keep their eyes open to the revelations which God is always making through his providence and by his Spirit they are often openly at war.

We find in the Old Testament traces of a conflict of this sort between the prophetic and the priestly classes. The priests represented the religion of routine; the prophets the religion of insight and expectation. From the days of the captivity onward the priests had it all their own way; the voice of the prophets was heard but faintly. The last prophetic utterance, that of Malachi, is a swift denunciation of the blindness and the dead formalism of the priestly class:

"A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if I then be a Father, where is mine honor? and if I be a Master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. . . . And now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you. If ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory unto my name, saith the Lord of hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings. . . . For the priests' lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts. But ye have departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts."

This word of Malachi is but the keynote of the denunciations pronounced against this whole class by John the Baptist, the last of the Hebrew prophets, and by our Lord himself, at a later day. These sticklers for ceremony, these ecclesiastical martinets, these devotees of routine, were the only people in the land who felt the weight of our Master's curse. "Blind guides," he calls them. "Ye fools and blind!" he cries out more than once in hot indignation against them. "Ye can discern the face of the sky, but ye cannot discern the signs of the times." Vision there is none. You know nothing of any truth outside your formularies. You are utterly oblivious of all that God is doing in the world to-day. "Ye build the sepulchres of the prophets [the dead ones] and garnish the tombs of the righteous" that lived in former generations; but that brave fidelity to present truth, that quick response to the immediate call of God, which made these men prophets, is the very spirit that you are trying to strangle in this generation; "wherefore ye witness to yourselves that ye are sons of them that slew the prophets."

The day never comes when the truth of these words is not made manifest by many living examples. There never is a time when the slavish devotees of routine and tradition are not making war upon those who look for more light to break forth from God's holy Word and God's marvelous universe; never a time when the children of the night are not seeking to expel from their fellowship the children of the day. The reverent and confident expectation which Christ enjoins is an offense which many a disciple of his has expiated at the hands of those who assume the direction of his kingdom in the world.

Yet we must suppose that these men themselves give some sort of meaning to the Saviour's injunction, and imagine themselves to be in some way obeying it. "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch." What do they suppose these words to mean? What duty do they find enjoined in them?

It is the duty of suspicion and criticism. It is for errors, for aberrations of belief, for shortcomings in the observance of the routine to which they are devoted, that they believe themselves appointed to watch. They have a standard of doctrine, subscription to which they insist upon as of primary obligation, and they watch to see whether anybody varies from that standard in the confession of his faith. They have certain technical rules of conduct to which they require all men to conform, and they watch to see whether anybody deviates from these rules in his daily practice. Vigilant they always are; argus-eyed in their scrutiny of the opinions and the motives of their brethren; but their inquisition always has a retrospective reference; they look to see whether there is perfect conformity on the part of other people to a historic or traditional rule. Their vigilance is the vigilance of a detective; their occupation is that of the heresy-hunter.

Now, it is obvious that this habit of suspicion and criticism is a habit that may easily lead to great abuses. The spirit which it fosters is not the spirit of Christ. Indeed, the temper of the heresy-hunter is precisely the temper which we often witness in those incorrigible unbelievers who are always fond of finding fault with Christians. The heresy-hunter within and the scoffer without the Church are kindred spirits. Both of them find their occupation in picking flaws with the beliefs or the conduct of their fellow-men. The Pharisees (the traditionists) and the Sadducees (the skeptics) were at one in their endeavors to entangle our Lord in his talk. When the one party failed in making a point against him, the other was always ready to try. "The chief priests and the scribes and the elders," when they heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, "sent unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, that they might catch him in talk." This hateful, censorious temper that likes to find fault, that rejoices in holding up to view the errors and the inconsistencies of others, is a bad trait of human nature that is not wholly eliminated at conversion; and the man who before he joined the Church was fond of pointing out the failings of church members, will be likely to become a mighty hunter of heresy if he ever becomes a leader in the Church. That this is the very antithesis of the Christian temper I need not stop to prove.

But some will be asking whether this is not a harsh judgment upon the men who are so active in detecting and punishing heresy. Are not many of them truly honest and conscientious men? Undoubtedly. These Pharisees were honest and conscientious men. Saul of Tarsus was a thoroughly honest and conscientious man. He verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. He thought that he ought to exterminate the Nazarene heresy. But the spirit that predominated in his life was the spirit of the detective and the heresy-hunter, the spirit that is always on the watch for errors and faults in others; and when a man's conscience prescribes this as one of the main duties of life—when a man's conscience makes him sharp to see and swift to punish other men's failures and sins—then his conscience is behaving itself in a very unchristian fashion, and the first thing that he needs to do is to get his conscience converted, so that it shall be a Christian conscience, ruled by the law of love, not rejoicing in the iniquity or the error of his fellow-men, but ready to believe all things good of them, and to hope for things still better.

The indulgence of this temper and the cultivation of this habit of suspicion and criticism are sure to result in great intellectual and spiritual blindness. For this spirit can only exist in connection with fixed and rigid traditional rules. If a man is to set himself up as the detective of heresy and the censor of conduct, he must, of course, have some unvarying standards with which he can compare the opinions and the actions of men. He must have his beliefs all formulated, and his laws of behavior all laid down. There is, therefore, no opportunity in his system for the free play of the soul's powers in the investigation of truth. Such an investigation might result in some modification of the formulas and rules by which this censor judges; thus his infallibility would be discredited and his occupation gone. He is, then, and must be, from the very nature of the function which he undertakes to fulfill, a foe of all development. He is watching for a lack of conformity to his standards; how can he be watching, at the same time, for new truth that may make these standards obsolete? It is, therefore, with him a fundamental maxim that no essential change can be made in the statements of truth which he holds. His bondage to the *ipsissima verba* of the ancient symbols becomes unquestioning and even abject.

When a man has fallen into this mental

habit, he at once becomes one of the most dangerous adversaries of the kingdom of God. For the very genius of that kingdom is movement, progress. The mustard-seed that becomes a tree, the leaven that pervades and quickens the whole lump, the kernel that springs up secretly and becomes first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear—these are the types by which our Lord describes it. And he who assumes that it is stationary and unprogressive in any department of its life—in its intellectual expression, in its social organization, in its practical working—so that one formula of philosophy forever declares it, and one rule of polity forever incorporates it, and one type of character forever reveals it—directly contradicts the word of the Lord, and sets himself in opposition to the very genius of his religion. What is more, he who adopts this rule of judgment finds himself all the while at variance with the facts of life and of history. "There can be no substantial change in Christian philosophy," he insists. But such changes are taking place, and have been taking place in all the ages. And so he is tempted to conceal, to misrepresent, or to ignore the plainest facts; he learns the easy lesson of insincerity; he becomes a palterer with the truth that is given him to teach. And thus the intellectual vice to which he is addicted becomes the parent of a grievous moral fault by which the very foundations of character are undermined.

And this is not all. The method which he has adopted of rigidly enforcing traditional rules leads him to put the greatest emphasis upon things that are of the least importance, and to be quite unmindful of things that are of the highest moment. He is a disciple of the letter and not of the spirit; and therefore a slight deviation from the letter of the formula becomes a greater fault than the most flagrant violation of moral law. Not long ago an assembly of ministers in another State had two offenders to deal with. One of them, an earnest and blameless man, had taught the doctrine of conditional immortality—the doctrine that the punishment of the incorrigibly wicked finally ends with their extinction; the other had frequently been drunk on the streets. The first of these was expelled from the ministry; the second was forgiven and reinstated. This is only a specimen of what is taking place very often in ecclesiastical assemblies. In these assemblies, as everybody knows, the whole stress of the inquiry into the fitness of a man to preach the Gospel is commonly put upon his intellectual conformity to the traditional creed, while the deeper things of character, of temper, of moral and spiritual fitness, are either ignored or touched upon in the most cursory way. We all know ministers, some of us know a good many of them, who are morally unfit to preach the Gospel. I do not mean that they are drunkards or counterfeiters, but they are ugly and spiteful and mean-spirited; they have the unhappy faculty of getting the ill will of most of the people that they come in contact with, and they preach what they think is the Gospel in such a hard, fierce, bitter way that it drives more men away from Christ than it wins to his service. That is the kind of men they are, and everybody knows what kind of men they are; but when such an one comes before a council or a presbytery it is not often that any voice is heard against installing him; for he is sure to be found fearfully and wonderfully orthodox, and orthodoxy is the principal thing. But let some minister of the most gentle and Christian temper, who has proved himself to have the power of winning the love of men, not only for himself, but also for his Master and his message, come before this same council, and indicate some slight intellectual divergence from the historic creed, and the voices of the heresy-hunters will be raised in a chorus of protest against him.

Such a perverted judgment as this is quite too current throughout the Church. Many persons subscribe to it who are not in any proper sense hunters of heresy; but it is to the heresy-hunters that its currency is due. It is they who have shaped it and imposed it upon the churches. And it is high time that those who have hitherto acquiesced in it began to ask themselves what kind of judgment this is that puts the details of doctrine above the interests of character, and punishes a small difference of opinion ten times more severely than a great sin.

Another result of the development of the detective element in the character of a professing Christian is a tendency to pessimism. The standards, as we have seen, by which such a censor judges of men's beliefs and men's actions are always traditional standards. They were well enough adapted to the life of a past age, but they are not adapted to the present age. The thought of men has gone away from these formularies; the changed conditions of life have vacated these rules of conduct of all their binding force. This traditionist finds, therefore, that men do not respect his standards, and the discovery fills him with dismay. It is a sign to him that the fountains of the great deep of theology and morals are broken up, and that the deluge is surely coming. It makes him take gloomy views of the present state of society, and fills his mouth with lamentations over the degeneracy of the age. Besides, a man who makes it his business to find fault is likely to find plenty of it. We generally discover what we are looking for. The eye sees what it is trained to see. And he who spends his time in watching other people's errors and sins naturally comes to the conclusion that this is a very erroneous and sinful world. Feeding on such stuff will give any man a bad kind of spiritual dyspepsia. And so he comes to take severe and ascetic views of doctrine as well as of life. The harsher and more threatening aspects of truth are the only ones that he distinctly sees. Total depravity is the only dogma that he heartily believes in.

I heard a sermon once on the text, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," and the comment by many hearers was that the preacher spent so much time in showing how sin abounded, and made such a strong presentation of that part of the text, that there was very little room left in which to show how grace did much more abound; that truth was very feebly presented, and the impression left by the sermon was exactly the reverse of the truth taught by the text, namely, that, though grace somewhat abounded, sin did much more abound. This is exactly the aspect of things which our friend the heresy-hunter takes comfort in portraying. His whole view of the world, and of the kingdom of God in the world, is gloomy, hopeless, sullen. He has no real faith in the victory of righteousness; all the signs that he sees are ominous of evil; his horoscope contains not a single star.

By and by he comes to feel that the people whom he is watching, who fail to conform to his standards, are people who have no rights that he is bound to respect. He talks bitterly about them behind their backs, saying things of them that he would never venture to say to them; trying in stealthy and ungenerous ways to create public opinion against them. He is not always careful to tell the truth about those who disagree with him; misrepresentation of a subtle and mischievous sort is a weapon often in his hand. This is natural enough. The detective is not commonly a judicial person; his business is to make out a case against the person he is watching. He who takes up this rôle is likely to become unscrupulous and reckless in his censure, so that his zeal for the truth comes at last to be heated with the flame of a pure malignity. There is a solemn lesson in the etymology of the devil's name. Diabolos means primarily an accuser.

Now, my friends, the picture that I have shown you is not a fancy sketch; it is not a caricature; it is a faithful representation of a class of men who are to be found among us, and who make themselves quite prominent as the defenders and custodians of the faith. And I ask you to judge whether the character in which these traits are seen is a representative Christian character. Are the men of whom these things are wholly true, or even approximately true, the men who ought to be ruling in the councils of our churches and giving tone and direction to our ecclesiastical bodies? Is a man who finds in the Saviour's injunction to watch his commission as a theological detective, and who by virtue of this office becomes the devotee of traditions and blind to all the revelations that God is making in the world to-day; who thus loses all sense of perspective in his moral judgments, and, while keeping a keen conscience for peppermint and caraway and fennel, lets judgment, mercy, and truth go by default; who becomes a pessimist in his views of the present time and an exponent only of that which is harsh and hopeless and forbidding in religion, and who, in his zeal for the extirpation of heresy, often fails to be just to those whom he seeks to censure—is this the style of man to whom the churches of this land are to look for leadership? God forbid! For the temper which I have described is as completely opposite to all that is Christian as anything can be, and the mental habit which goes with it is the essence of the deadliest and most damning unbelief. Who is a skeptic if he is not a skeptic who has no faith in the virtue of man nor in the victorious grace of God? Who is an infidel if he is not an infidel who rejects with scorn the clear revelations of God's truth that come in the enlarging knowledge of his works and of his ways among the children of men? If there is one law that is written all over both Testaments, that is stamped upon the very foundations of the faith, it is the law of progress in the kingdom of God; who, then, is the enemy of Christianity if it is not the man who makes void this law by his traditions?

These questions are likely to be urged, in the future, with some persistency. For there are those among us who find in the command of Christ something besides a detective's commission, and in the Gospel that he has given us a living force and not a crystallized form; and when these men are called to account by the traditionists and the heresy-hunters, it is not likely that they will always be content with defending themselves. They ought not to suffer themselves to stand on the defensive. They ought not to allow that the view of truth which they hold is one that needs to be excused or apologized for; they ought not to admit that the kind of men of whom we have been speaking have any right to judge them. When the right of men to preach the Gospel is challenged, some people will wish to look into the right of the challengers. Not in any irreverent or revolutionary spirit, but with the emphasis of a deep conviction, these men will be asked: "What is this religion in whose behalf you appear as the prosecuting attorneys? Is it Christianity, or is it something else? Is it a religion whose law is tradition and whose spirit is distrust of God and men? Is it a religion whose votaries are detectives rather than disciples, and whose leaders are censors rather than seers? Is it a religion that makes men so blind to moral distinctions that they count a small heresy worse than a great sin? If it is, then it is not the Christian religion, and you are not the representatives of Christ in the world.

"What is more, we do not believe that the detective or the inquisitor has any place in Christ's service. We find no such office provided for or even suggested. We believe that the temper and habit of mind which are developed by this pursuit are utterly foreign to Christianity. We believe that it is not by ferreting out and punishing unbelief and error, but by declaring the truth, and by incarnating and living the truth, that the Church is to be kept pure. Tares will grow with the wheat, but it is not our business to pull up the tares; it is our business to sow the good seed everywhere, beside all waters, and let God take care of the tares.

"So, then, we meet your challenge of our right to preach the Gospel, by demurring to your whole proceeding as unwarranted, and by calling on you to show that the system which you are trying to propagate is not a bad counterfeit of the true faith of Christ. While the other heresies are being investigated, we want the heresy of suspicion, and the heresy of hate, and the heresy of cold distrust, and the heresy of moral blindness, and the heresy of pessimism, and the heresy of evil speaking looked into; and we desire, in all candor and kindness, to know whether those who find in their own eyes such beams as these ought not first to cast them out before proceeding to cast out the motes of theological error from the eyes of their brethren. God forbid that we should judge our brethren; but when our brethren insist on judging us, then they shall be judged—and the standard to which we make appeal is not the Westminster Confession, nor the Augsburg Symbol, nor the Thirty-nine Articles, but the Sermon on the Mount. And when those who in their lives and in their doctrine are constantly setting at naught that divine teaching rise up to condemn us because we have ventured to reject some phrase that men have fashioned, we shall simply answer that they are greatly exceeding their authority."

And now, brethren beloved, let us use the liberty that belongs to us and the opportunity that is ours of proclaiming to men the truth as it is in Jesus, in all its simplicity and purity. We are not on the defensive here; we do not borrow leave to be the disciples of Jesus Christ of any organization; we are responsible to our Master, and to him alone. The truth that he helps us to see, that we will try to tell; the life that he lived in the flesh, that we will endeavor to live. If any shall call in question our right to teach the Gospel as we understand it, we shall look first to see whether their lives show that they have been with Jesus and have learned his method and his secret. If they have not, we will not trouble ourselves to answer their questions; if they have, we will sit at their feet and learn of them; but even they shall not judge us, for one is our Master, even Christ.

And these words of our Master—"What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch"—we will try, more and more, to learn what they mean. We know that they do not warrant us in watching other disciples with the eye of the critic or the censor; we know that this habit of mind is, above most things, hateful to him. To watch ourselves lest we become suspicious and censorious and credulous of evil tales about our neighbors; to watch our conduct lest we hurt them by want of fidelity or want of sympathy—this, we know, is part of the lesson of vigilance that he seeks to teach us. But this is the smallest part of the lesson. To watch for hurts that we can heal, for halting steps that we can steady, for burdens of infirmity or trouble that we can help to carry, for ways in which we may give our thought, our care, our love, ourselves, for the enlarging and the brightening of the lives of our fellow-men, serving them with humblest fidelity and leading them with cords of sympathy and brotherhood in the ways of righteousness and peace—this is the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

And then to watch for the coming of our Lord—not for his coming in that coarse, literal fashion which some disciples picture to themselves—not to see the figure of a man astride of a cumulus somewhere in the sky—but to discern the signs of his spiritual presence in purer laws and gentler manners, in a braver virtue and a brighter hope and a stronger faith—to watch for such things, to expect them, and to be glad in the Lord when we see them. "This, then," said the beloved disciple, "is the message which we have heard of him and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." "And these things write we unto you that your joy may be full." This is the message that we have heard, brethren; God help us to utter it with all clear fidelity. This is the gospel that we have to preach, the gospel of good news, the gospel of peace, the glorious gospel of the blessed God. It is not with the energy of fear or despair that we are working, but with the energy of a mighty hope. It is not with the weapons of criticism and suspicion that we are fighting; we have nothing to do with them; the weapons of our warfare are faith in God and love for man. It is not with grim visages and glum demeanor that we go about our Master's business; for hath he not said, "Lo, I am with you alway!" and in his presence is fullness of joy.

PARAGRAPHIC.

A VERY poor actor having played the part of the ghost in "Hamlet" for many years, Saphir, the German wit, on seeing him, said: "It would be a good thing if this man gave up the ghost, so that somebody else could take his part." A young poet once sent the humorist an "Ode to Immortality," requesting his opinion of it. Saphir returned the manuscript, with the message: "This package will never reach its address." "Three persons," remarked the wit, "sleep soundly—a child, a corpse, and a night watchman." During his sojourn in X—— Saphir was frequently in the society of a well-known theatrical manager, whose dulness was notorious. "How strange it is that my legs go to sleep every day!" he remarked, upon one occasion. "How can you wonder?" returned Saphir, "they are always in your company."—*Churchman.*

ABOUT the late Lord President Inglis, a correspondent in the *British Weekly* writes:

In his earlier days his temper was sometimes found a useful possession, as on one occasion when he endeavored in vain (through an interpreter) to get some small fragment of truth from a Gaelic witness at Inverness, and the following dialogue occurred:

Inglis. "Did he strike Munro with the stick?"

Witness. "They were saying that he did."

I. "Did you see it?"

W. "I was not looking much."

I. "But did he do it?"

W. "I do not believe that his father's son would do anything wrong."

I. "But did he strike the blow that morning?"

W. "It was a fine morning whatever."

I. (turning from the interpreter to the witness): "Sir, will you answer, yes or no, *if your language admits of so fine a distinction?*"

WHO is not shocked by the answer of the college porter, charged to admit none but dons, to Mrs. Whately? "You canna come in, mem." "Oh, but I'm the archbishop's lady." "Well, mem, my orders are positive. I would not let you in, even if you were the archbishop's wife."—*Churchman.*

A YORKSHIRE vicar once received the following notice regarding a marriage from a parishioner: "This is to give you notis that I and Miss Jemima Arabella Brearley is comin' to your church on Saturday afternoon nex, to undergo the operation of matrimony at your hands. Please be promp, as the cab is hired by the hour." The "operation" was performed in due course.—*Churchman.*

A BRIGHT ten-year-old girl, whose father is addicted to amateur photography, attended a trial at court the other day for the first time. This was her account of the judge's charge: "The judge made a long speech to the jury of twelve men, and then sent them off into a little dark room to develop."—*Zion's Herald.*

A CORRESPONDENT of *The Evangelist* protests vigorously in that paper against the course of a certain daily journal in denouncing Professor Briggs while he is under citation for trial. Speaking of the writer of these articles, he says: "I cannot say what his capacity for criticising such scholars as Professors Briggs and Brown may be. But it is very evident from the tone of his creed that though he may know 'small Latin and less Greek,' he is nevertheless a pronounced hebray-ist!"

"THAT commercial spirit which judges a pastor like a cart-horse—*by what he can draw,*" is the Rev. Dr. Sturtevant's humorous way of describing a feeling which is perhaps not quite so rare in this country as he generously seems to imagine.—*Independent* (*London*).

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Die Entstehung des Alttestamentlichen Kanons. Historisch-kritische Untersuchung von Dr. G. Wildeboer, Professor der Theologie zu Groningen. Gotha: Perthes; New York: Stechert, 1891. 8vo, pp. xii., 164, 3.60 marks.

The Change of Attitude toward the Bible. A lecture given under the auspices of the Boston Board of the American Institute of Sacred Literature, February 17th, 1891. By Joseph Henry Thayer, Professor in Harvard University. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. 69.

The Oracles of God. Nine lectures on the nature and extent of Biblical Inspiration and on the special significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the present time. With two appendices. By W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford Preacher at Whitehall. Second edition, revised. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. xv., 156.

Who Wrote the Bible? A Book for the People. By Washington Gladden. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891. 16mo, pp. iv., 381, $1.25.

An Introduction to the Old Testament. By the Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, D.D., Ph.D., Bampton Lecturer (1878), Donnellan Lecturer (1880–81), Examiner in Hebrew, etc., University of London. (Theological Educator Series.) New York: Whittaker, 1890. 12mo. pp. xvi., 226, 75 cents net.

Stumbling Stones Removed from the Word of God. By Arthur T. Pierson. New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 1891. 18mo, pp. 82, cloth, 50 cents.

It is Written. A careful study of the Gospels as to all the words and acts of our Lord and other things contained therein touching the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament. By Thomas Scott Bacon, D.D. New York: Ketcham, 1891. 12mo, pp. 111.

These titles represent some of the recent literature on both sides of one of the prominent questions of the day, though it must be confessed that the scholarship in this list is painfully on one side. It is a significant feature that so many of these books and such a proportion of others in the same field are addressed to a popular audience. The volumes of Wildeboer and Wright are intended for pastors and theological students, to whom a brief compendious statement will be welcome. While scholarly they do not pretend to be exhaustive. They are calculated to be of service to those who wish aid at the threshold or who desire to gain a rapid survey of the field in question. The other five volumes are popular in purpose and treatment, being intended to instruct the average intelligent layman, and represent four denominations, two professors and three ministers being the authors.

Professor Wildeboer presents us with a virtual second edition of his book, this time in German dress, in the hope that it will reach a wider circle of readers than was possible to the Dutch edition. The wish which Professor Cheyne expressed with regard to the former edition may be repeated in regard to this one, that it might come before the public also in English form. The object of the writer is to present a tenable view of the process by which the Old Testament canon took its shape and the principles which guided therein. It is of immense importance to know what the Jewish conception of canonicity was. We are apt to apply the word without question always in the sense which it bears in our vocabulary to-day, rather than to inquire what the notion of the ancients was. So long as we regard the Old Testament canon from our own standpoint, so long will we fail to grasp the true relation and significance of the Old Testament. It is also not without significance that the canon was not absolutely fixed in all three divisions for the Jews till in the neighborhood of 200 A.D. (cf. p. 67). The process of canonization seems to have been rather one of weeding out than of inserting. The pre-eminent position of the Pentateuch was such that it was the norm, and the question of canonicity was resolved into the question whether a later writing was in accord therewith (p. 90). Admission to the Jewish canon was then conditioned by agreement with the "Law," and as a whole the sacred writings are called by that name in John x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25, 1 Cor. xiv. 21. That which had relation to classic times or which purported to come from an ancient author seems finally to have been admitted to the canon, though such books as "Wisdom," though full of reverence for the "Law," and 1 Maccabees, which contains a veritable and important account of a later period of Jewish history, were excluded apparently merely because they were the works of known late writers. At the same time it is instructive to note that the discussions of Jewish scholars as to the canonicity of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Esther, continued into the second century of our era.

Of course this book contains much which will be far from satisfactory to all such as have a fear lest the "higher critics" shall succeed actually in oversetting the very ark of God. These results, however, are not based upon the conclusions of literary criticism, but are rather strictly historical in their character and consequently more forceful for that very fact.

The title of Professor Thayer's volume stands for a fact. It is becoming more and more evident that the change is here and that it affects not only the professors and scholars of Germany, but many of the professors of this land and a considerable proportion of the clergy and not a few of the laity. These are not satisfied with tradition as their main guide. Jewish rabbinical fables have long enough obscured the truth. Mediæval dogmatism and its modern representatives have lost their power to compel assent, and *a priori* reasoning is to be brought face to face with the actual facts. But by a strange sort of logic those who try to remove the barnacle-like accretions are often suspected of harboring the intention of scuttling the ship. How false such a suspicion is will be evident to the reader of this little essay. The thesis of Professor Thayer is that the theology of to-day has "laid a disproportionate emphasis on the full and final character of Scripture teaching relative to the whole range of speculation and conduct, life and destiny." The claims of this "*exaggerated* theory" are tested by consideration of the circumstances in which the New Testament originated and its intrinsic characteristics, the theory's defiance of the law of historic sequence and proportion, the misuse of the biblical term "Word of God," the impossibility of consistent application of the theory, the fact that it sets the scholar at variance with the Christian, and is repressive of the spiritual life of the Church. On the contrary, the "change of view" "consists simply in conforming our opinion respecting the Bible to the undoubted properties of the book itself." It is passing strange that those who desire to learn just what the Bible witnesses as to itself are met by rebuff and reproach by those who have derived their ideas from tradition, or who support their position upon *a priori* considerations while claiming to be the only true friends and defenders of the Bible. Between the higher critics and traditionalists or dogmaticians there can be no peace because of the fundamental difference in their points of departure and their methods. But for the latter, with their rationalistic procedure, to arrogate all right to themselves and to denounce their opponents, and deny their Christian character and their common honesty, is a perversion which the common sense of men will not long tolerate. This little book of Professor Thayer is a bugle-note which should be echoed from one end of the land to the other. It is decided in its tone and yet it is not harsh or discordant. It has the ring of honesty, conviction and truth, giving no uncertain sound.

Professor Sanday's book is an attempt to set in order the probable results of criticism in its effect upon religion. It is the effort of a scholar to allay the suspicions and to quiet the fears entertained by devout and pious persons in view of the sweeping denunciation of all critics, reverent and irreverent alike, as "destructive." Their fears have been fed by statements such as this: "A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine [of inspiration], but the Scripure's claims. . . ." The critics have declared that there are errors there so far as their present knowledge goes, and therefore they are denounced as worse than infidels. They are accused not only of attempting to disprove inspiration, but of overthrowing "our" doctrine. It is reassuring in the midst of such turmoil to take up a book like this by Professor Sanday. Here are summed up some truths that should be most widely received and pondered. No matter whether we agree with him in all points or not, it is well to have such testimony. What is to be the final outcome, even if all which the critics claim should prove true? Shall we lose our Bible? Will the sun be darkened and the moon withdraw her light? What loss will there be, and is there any compensating gain?

Briefly and baldly stated, the old position was that the Bible is the Word of God, and as such is absolutely authoritative in all its parts, because, since God is its author, it must be infallible and inerrant in its entirety. If this is so a concordance is all that we need to prosecute its study and to learn its commands. But the critics have rendered this "royal road" difficult, if not impossible. Henceforth the principle must take the place of the precept, and principles are notably harder to conform to than precepts are to obey. Those who regard this as a loss confess a preference for the particular command above the systematic study of the Word which eventuates in broad principles. But what are the gains? The first is in *truth*. If the Bible is true, by means of its study we shall arrive at the truth in regard to it and its teachings. The views which finally obtain will be true views. Devotion to the Bible would dictate that we dismiss prepossessions and prejudices, and allow it to speak for itself without interference. The second is in *security*. That which has been fully tested will stand. There is no danger that the essentials will perish even if human dogmatic structures are swept away and obliterated. The third is in *reality*. The relation between life and teaching in Scripture is vital, not formal, and the life informed by a true view of God's dealing with men will conform to the purpose of God. But suppose that it be admitted that the Bible is not inerrant in all its statements, how can it be used? Much as heretofore. No legitimate use of Scripture will be discontinued, but there will be added a method which will have more of real contact with human life, because it will be constructed in accordance with the actual dealings of God with men in the past. This method makes God a real and moving factor in human life instead of a being who has spoken in the Bible once for all. There are some who regard the change as entirely a gain, with no real loss whatever.

The volumes of Drs. Gladden and Wright are similar in their aim, though the difference in the classes whom they address has caused a decided difference in the treatment. The former presents an "Introduction" suited to the intelligent Christian who is interested to know what the truth may be. It is the more adapted to meet its purpose, since it is the result of the labors of specialists filtered through the mind of one who does not claim that distinction, but who is able to state the salient facts in a way which makes the subject plain to the average reader. This has been done in an admirable manner, and the book is a valuable addition to the popular literature of the subject. Considering the audience in view, it may be questioned whether the author is always wise in his denunciation of old views. A statement of the facts, allowing them to speak for themselves, would arouse less antagonism and would facilitate the acceptance of the truth. Intolerance is bad anywhere, but to adopt the enemy's weapon is inadvisable in religious matters.

Dr. Wright's book should be in the hands of every minister and every theological student. It is a valuable addition to our growing Old Testament literature. It is abreast of the progressive Christian scholarship of the day, and it presents the facts as ordinarily accepted in a plain and succinct fashion. It does not go to the lengths of extreme criticism, but is rather conservative than radical in its statements. The avowed purpose of the volume has been achieved, "to give the ascertained results of modern criticism within very confined limits." The amount of material packed into these 226 pages is quite beyond expectation, and yet in spite of condensation the treatment is clear and the statements lucid and comprehensive.

Dr. Pierson's book is that of an apologist who is none too consistent with himself, of an exegete who grasps at an explanation all too easily if it offers plausible means of escape from a difficulty, of a dogmatician who takes liberties which he denies to others, of an advocate anxious to establish his cause. It might almost have been written, *mutatis mutandis*, by a Mohammedan in reference to the Koran. It is suggested that where the New Testament writers quote from the Septuagint a text which differs from the Hebrew, "The Spirit guided them so to do, in order to bring more clearly to view the inspired meaning of sacred words"—that is, a later inspiration corrected its former infallible words, which contained error or failed to convey the meaning which inspiration intended (cf. p. 40). The method of procedure in connection with 1 Cor. vii. 40 (p. 24) is somewhat startling, where Paul, "instead of disclaiming inspiration," "rather affirms with peculiar emphasis the apostolic warrant for his instruction." It is denied to others to pronounce judgment as to what is "circumstantial" in the biblical record and what is "essential," and yet the same right is exercised when we are told that Scripture is not affected "materially" by the "hundreds of thousands of variations" in the text; "not one essential truth is in the slightest modified" (p. 62). The book as a whole is an example of the lengths to which a man will go in order to support a preconceived theory. "Current popular phraseology, which is known to be scientifically inaccurate, may find its way into the Bible simply as a prevailing *idiom of speech*" (p. 52), and yet "Moses in the Law" is an absolute and authoritative assertion that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

In line with this last statement is the whole book of Dr. Bacon. The fundamental assumption of this book is that the Scriptures existed at the beginning of our era just as we have them now, being "such in their various titles, divisions, and apparent chronology." This is the fundamental position, with which is coupled another assumption which is not expressed, but which is necessary to the completeness of the argument, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and that it never was changed, altered, or "edited" afterward. To have stated it would have rendered the book unnecessary, and have offered no opportunity for the abuse of the "Higher Critics." But abuse of the "higher criticism" can scarcely establish these fundamental theses. No doubt the name is unfortunate. "Higher" is arrogant, and "criticism" applied to the Word of God sounds preposterous and presumptuous, if not blasphemous. But is any one justified by the facts in saying that the "new theory" "is evidently *not* the work of very devout souls, . . . but rather of mere literary ambition and eagerness to find anything new to oppose to traditional beliefs"? (p. 92.) Is it really correct to say that the higher criticism is one of the "works of the Devil"? (pp. 98-99.) The author is careless in his diction, while in his logic, in his assertions, in his assumptions, and in his conclusions much is to be desired. CHARLES R. GILLETT.

NEW YORK.

THE APOCALYPSE: ITS STRUCTURE AND PRIMARY PREDICTIONS. By DAVID BROWN, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1891. 12mo, pp.xl., 224. $1.25.

A book, or "booklet," as the author modestly terms it, written by a man in his eighty-eighth year, is remarkable on that account. Principal Brown, in his preface, tells how he was led to prepare it, and his purpose in doing so. He calls it repeatedly "an A B C" of the Apocalypse. It is neither a commentary nor a discussion of the Second Advent, but simply a series of articles on the authenticity (or genuineness), date, and design of the Apocalypse, and then a theory of the structure of the book, illustrated by exposition of such parts of it as may serve to maintain the theory of interpretation upheld by the author. Hence, the little volume is all the more remarkable for the self-denying effort it indicates, the effort to omit what was not essential for the announced purpose.

Principal Brown, as is generally known, published a book on the Second Advent nearly fifty years ago. In the present volume he maintains very much the same positions he then stated. But it would seem that the chief motive for this little work was a desire to oppose that theory of interpretation which is now applied by many English and Scotch writers to the Apocalypse. The author's townsman, Professor Milligan, has done much to disseminate the "ethical" or "spiritual" view of the Book of Revelation, virtually denying its predictive character, that is, so far as detailed reference to future events is involved. Principal Brown not only regards it as predictive, but, accepting the continuously historical theory of interpretation, feels able to point with some confidence to certain events as fulfilments of the predictions. That this is done with less detail than is usual in such works is owing partly to the limited purpose of the volume and partly to the author's views of the millennium.

Taking up the several parts, we find about thirty-five pages of "Introduction," discussing the authorship of the book, which is held to be Johannean; the date, which is placed in the reign of Domitian; and the design, as has been indicated in the preceding paragraph. For myself I am glad to find this veteran expositor defending the later date of the Apocalypse (in the reign of Domitian). It alone has external evidence to support it; and the internal grounds adduced for the earlier date still seem to me insufficient proof. The difference of style, of which so much is made, is not inconsistent with the later date. It is precisely an *old* man, wrapt in apocalyptic vision, who would revert at once to the idiom of his youth, the rougher Hebraistic style of a Palestinian Jew. Principal Brown adds a number of arguments, drawn mainly from the characteristics of the book itself, against the early date. In his discussion of the design of the Apocalypse the author criticises Professor Milligan very keenly, and does not fail to refer to the preposterous statement of Professor Harnack (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, article *Revelation*) "that the Apocalypse is the most intelligible book of the New Testament." The Introduction closes with an *addendum*, in which a paragraph penned by Sir William Hamilton is shown to be untrustworthy in its statements. Principal Brown seems to enjoy this piece of work. In these days, when so many specialists in other matters undertake to lay down the law for biblical scholars, it is worth while noticing how utterly misleading and inaccurate so great a man as Sir William Hamilton can become when he deals with questions out of his department. *Ne sutor ultra crepidum* has its application to some very distinguished people.

Contending for the artistic structure of the Apocalypse, the venerable author most correctly recognizes the part of the "chorus" or "song" in the arrangement of the matter. "When any of the great epochal events is to occur, it is first announced in a burst of song, or similar form, the details of all that lead up to it being reserved for subsequent disclosures" (p. 79). Richard Wagner might have written this as the true theory of a great musical work. The attempt to find seven series of sevens in the book is not made by Principal Brown. He thinks the seven seals cover the whole period of prophetic disclosure, but does not regard the seven trumpets and vials as strictly synchronous with the seals; they are rather subdivisions. Between these he finds explanatory visions with a symbolism of their own. Having made this explanation, he proceeds to take up such details as illustrate his view. While there is no extended exegetical treatment, the foot-notes again and again introduce critical and grammatical comments. As might be expected, the author finds the most prominent predictions those which refer to papal Rome. The "time, and times, and half a time" (chap. xii. 14) are regarded as = 1260 years, during which papal Rome is dominant. "The beast" is not one of the emperors, but papal Rome. The 666 puzzle, as read by Harnack and others, he makes light of. The two witnesses he refers to the Holy Spirit dwelling in true believers, the wilderness being the high Alps, Savoy, etc. The end of the 1260 years is fixed at the Reformation period.

The vexed question of the "thousand years" is discussed quite fully, and the literal sense of the passage denied. Not only is the Second Advent regarded as post-millennial, but the author states that in the strictly prophetic part of the book there is no distinct reference to the Second Advent. Only in the preliminary and supplementary portions is this great event announced.

In the Addenda Principal Brown includes some matter omitted from its proper place, and also a stricture upon the Greek text of Westcott and Hort. Still he usually prefers the Revised Version. In one place he objects to the word "devils" as a rendering of the Greek *daimones*, but, like most British authors, fails to notice that the American revisers insist (in their Appendix) upon the correct rendering.

The style of the book is characteristic, though not so brusque as some of the author's previous works. Age seems to have mellowed it into a quaint *naïveté*. The little volume is handsomely printed, and will bear careful study.

It is possible that at some time in the future, when the drama of earth has progressed sufficiently to show the full significance of this symbolical representation of it—it is possible that then we may have a consistent and correct exposition of the "continuously historical" theory; but until then he who would profit most by reading the Apocalypse will be wise in regarding it as a great "oratorio," musical rather than pictorial, poetical rather than chronological, practical rather than predictive; so regarding it, one can derive not only consolation, but joy from the perusal. Even this volume, with its detailed interpretation, recognizes something of the character indicated above. It is this poetic insight in Principal Brown which most recommends him as an interpreter of the Apocalypse in the judgment of the present writer.

M. B. RIDDLE.

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ALLEGHENY, PA.

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS (EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE). By the Rev. S. H. KELLOGG, D.D., author of "The Jews; or, Prediction and Fulfilment," "The Light of Asia and the Light of the World," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1891. 8vo, pp. viii., 566, $1.50.

This work is divided into three parts: Part I. gives the exposition of the law concerning the various offerings and institutions connected with "The Tabernacle Worship;" Part II. expounds "The Law of the Daily Life," including the descriptions of the Set Feasts and Seasons of the Lord; Part III. includes "The Promises and Threats of the Covenant" and the law "Concerning Vows."

Part I. opens with an introductory chapter on Lev. i. 1, which presents the origin, authority, purpose, and present-day use of Leviticus. In regard to *origin*, the author appeals, as some others have done before him, to the words of Christ, and appears to hold that our Lord definitely intended to teach the Mosaic authorship of the book. He does indeed, both in this chapter and elsewhere (pp. 256, 419), allow the claim of editorial redaction, and the view of Delitzsch in his later years is referred to if not with approval, at least with hospitality; but the theory which makes the codification of any appreciable number of the laws the work of priests in the time of Ezra is regarded as a denial of the religion established by Jesus Christ. It does not seem to me wise to risk so much as this upon the correctness of the author's interpretation of the New Testament passages. Indeed it is well said by Professor C. H. H. Wright (in his Introduction to the Old Testament, p. viii.), "The [Graf-Wellhausen] theory does not necessarily make the Pentateuch a mere fabrication of designing priests." The *purpose* of Leviticus is said to be to teach Israel the way of holiness and the need of redeeming mercy, and to show "the typical correspondence between the Levitical ritual and New Testament facts." Its *present-day* use lies in its admirable system of civil laws and in the fact that it contains by means of its "divinely chosen illustrations" a revelation of Christ. In the exposition of the various offerings, Dr. Kellogg gives the primary meaning of the passages, the spiritual lessons, and the applications to characteristics of the work of Christ. His view, in general, is that while all the animal offerings "foreshadowed the death of Christ as an expiation for our sins" (p. 94), this was the chief purpose of the sin-offering alone, in which "an appointed substitutionary victim" (p. 141) is the type of "the great Victim" who "bore our sins" and was "visibly laden with the curse of God" (p. 153). There are very few prescriptions in which the author cannot find a spiritual meaning, and later Scriptures are made the key to the interpretation, the mere allusion of subsequent passages being sometimes regarded as giving the true explanation of the original; *e.g.*, "in that frankincense was to be added to the meal-offering it is signified that this offering of the fruit of our labors to the Lord must ever be accompanied by prayer," and Ps. cxli. 2, Luke i. 10, Rev. v. 8, are quoted as very clear intimations of this meaning. Many will not be able to follow him when in the same connection they read that "in Holy Scripture leaven, without a single exception, is the established symbol of spiritual corruption" (p. 73), and they will think of Matt. xiii. 33 and other passages. The book of Leviticus is made very fruitful in types; and the author, while deprecating the confusion of "our own imaginings with the teaching of the Holy Ghost" in typology (p. 23), is certainly very skilful in following out the suggestions of the New Testament. For instance, he says, "We have seen the type of the day of atonement fulfilled in the entering into heaven of our Great High Priest; but in the type He came out again to bless the people—has that been fulfilled? Has He yet proclaimed absolution of sin to guilty Israel? . . . And thus Leviticus bids us look forward to a glorious future yet to come, when the great redemption shall at last be accomplished." It is not easy to get a clear notion of what is included in our author's idea of a "type" throughout the work. Passing the paragraphs in which he makes the several offerings typical of Christ, each in its own way, it is said that "by this sin-offering not only Aaron and his son were cleansed, but we read that hereby atonement was also made ‘for the altar;’ a mysterious type, reminding us,” etc. (p. 206); the week's delay appointed to the leper before he could come into the presence of God is regarded as representing in type the delay between the acceptance of a sinner and the resurrection morning (p. 356); type and symbol seem to be confounded (p. 364), and both to mean scarcely more than suggestion (p. 365). When the author speaks of the propriety of making “vows” at the present time (p. 107) and of Christ's “unanswered prayer” (p. 144), I cannot agree with him.

The other parts are treated in much the same way. The second part is, perhaps, the most satisfactory work in the book, the exposition of “The Law of Holiness” (Lev. xviii. 20) being especially good.

The chief excellencies of the work seem to me to be the clear way in which the Levitical institutions are set before us, and the devout spirit which appears throughout all the pages. The principal defect is the tendency to find a more highly developed theology in Leviticus than the book itself or other Scripture seems to warrant.

Charles Rufus Brown.
The Newton Theological Institution.

Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers. With Appendices. By William Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1890. Small 8vo, pp. xxviii., 318, $2.

This volume, from the pen of a well-known ecclesiastical historian, contains three popular and interesting lectures upon Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Augustine respectively, and a hundred and twenty-five pages of appendices illustrative of the life and influence of the Fathers mentioned, and of some of the controversies in which they were engaged.

The lectures, as their title indicates, are rather anecdotical than biographical. As such they are suggestive, and will doubtless help readers that are not themselves students of the Fathers, to a clearer conception of the characters and services of the three men.

In the main the author's estimates are just and his judgments discriminating. In his lecture upon Athanasius, however, he has fallen into the error, especially common among English writers, of representing the deity of Christ as the common faith of Christendom during the first three centuries, remarking that “the question then was whether this [viz., the adoration of “Christ as personally and literally divine”] should go on; whether it was defensible, or whether Christians were to reconsider their position and materially alter their way of thinking, feeling, and acting toward their Saviour. For if Arianism were true, this would become a religious duty for those who desired to keep the First Commandment.” Taken with proper limitations this is true, but unqualified as it stands it is misleading, in that it makes no allowance for the wide prevalence during the second century within the Orthodox Church of one or another kind of adoptionism, a form of belief which, as we may gather from Hermas and from the anonymous writer quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 28), was the common view at least of the Roman Church from an early period until the time of Victor. The truth is that in some respects Arianism was less of an innovation than Professor Bright's words seem to imply, and that in that fact lay something of its strength in its conflict with the developing Alexandrian Christology.

Beyond this we have no criticism to make upon the historical accuracy of the work.

Arthur C. McGiffert.
Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati.

Evidences of Christianity. Credibility and Inspiration of the New Testament Books. By J. W. McGarvey, A.M., Professor of Sacred History and Evidences in the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Louisville: Guide Printing and Publishing Co., 1891. 8vo, pp. vi., 223, $1.50.

The above volume embraces Part III. and Part IV. of a work on the evidences of Christianity, of which the first two parts, treating of the integrity of the New Testament text and the genuineness of the New Testament books, were published five years ago in a volume which “met with such a reception from the public as to encourage the author to continue the work; and he had progressed so far with it as to have written a large portion of part third, when a fire, which laid his dwelling in ruins, consumed his manuscript, together with all the notes and references which he had accumulated.” All intelligent readers and students, and especially those engaged in literary production, will appreciate what such a trial must involve, and will extend to the author their heartiest sympathy, while they will now congratulate him on the replacement of the lost material, and the final completion of the work.

In the present volume Part III., which occupies 167 pages, relates to the credibility of the New Testament books, and Part IV., which occupies 52 pages, to their inspiration. The work is intended for beginners, and is prepared with especial reference to class-room instruction in high schools and colleges. “It does not, therefore, attempt to exhaust the subject.” The book should in fairness be judged according to this modest limitation of its aim.

A corresponding limitation meets us in our author's sources, which are restricted apparently to the English language, his references to foreign authorities, *e.g.*, Strauss, Baur, Renan, being to the translations of their works. For the immediate purpose in view the author's equipment may be pronounced to be fairly sufficient, although a fuller acquaintance with the results of the best exegetical and literary criticism of the New Testament now accessible even in English in the works of Meyer, Reuss, Weiss, would have served to enrich his material for illustration, to correct occasional onesidedness of representation, and especially to furnish a more scientific point of view for the apologetic treatment of certain classes of difficulties in the New Testament books.

An example may be found in his application of Rawlinson's canons of historical criticism to the evangelists. Following the traditional view respecting the composition of the Gospels, he groups Matthew and John together under the first canon as “eye-witnesses of nearly all the events they record, and therefore as “having the highest degree of credibility;” Mark and Luke under the second canon as “writers who were not eye-witnesses, but wrote what had been narrated to them,” and as therefore “possessing the second degree of credibility.” But literary criticism shows that this distinction is illusory. As a matter of fact, the basal record of Mark, the “Proto-Mark,” as clearly falls under Canon I. as the “Proto-Matthew." Whereas so far as the final redaction is concerned, the evidence goes to show that each Gospel falls under Canon II. The titles of our Gospels, it is well known, are purely a matter of tradition; and we have good reason to believe, on the ground both of tradition and of internal evidence, that the second Gospel is quite as well entitled to be called the Gospel according to Peter, as the first to be called the Gospel according to Matthew.

In like manner the conclusions of literary criticism respecting the structure of the Gospels are important in their bearing on the question of their credibility as affected by their internal variations, and the difficulties which these variations present. The claim of credibility for the New Testament books is one which, of course, every devout believer in Christianity will emphatically maintain. This is fundamental to every other claim which can be made in their behalf. But does this credibility require the affirmation of absolute and undeviating harmony in every minute particular? Obviously not in itself considered. No such test of credibility is applied in the examination of other historical testimony. Where testimony comes from various sources, minor variations, and contradictions even, are looked for, and accepted without disturbance to our faith in honest testimony given by honest men. The absence of them would even in most cases be deemed suspicious. The same may be said of the credibility of the New Testament books. To admit discrepancies is not to deny the general credibility nor even the particular credibility and verisimilitude of the record. Far otherwise. The roots of the record clearly strike down into the facts. It is absolutely certain that the great multitude of the details are from the life; and no line of investigation is more fascinating in itself, more striking in its results, or more welcome to the believing heart than the discovery of "undesigned coincidences" in the records. The same may be said of the formal and especially the incidental confirmation of historic details in the New Testament from external sources.

But the question throughout is one of fact, not of theory. And, so regarded, our examination of the history and building, not of the written text only, but of the original record, the channels and processes through which it passed, and the complexity, in a relative sense at least, of the final result, makes it apparent that the attempt to force all the variant statements of the record into absolute and specific harmony in every detail is at once illogical, unhistoric, and vain. It establishes a vicious method of procedure, it starts from an untenable premise and it aims at an impracticable result. It exerts a prejudicial influence on the mind of the critic. Instead of leaving him free to give to each separate source its full and independent value, its distinct historic sense, and so to secure a living historic variety and fulness in the representation, it tends to blunt and to deaden the individualities of the specific factors, and to force the entire record into a mechanical uniformity, sacrificing its life, spontaneity, and freedom to a superficial regularity and consistency. While each part of the record reflects its light on other parts, it would be an unwarranted procedure to subject any one part to undue pressure from the rest; to constrain, *e.g.*, a meaning on what Mark says, at variance with that which his statement would naturally yield, for no other reason than that Matthew says this or that. As Cæsar's wife must be above suspicion, so the interpreter of Scripture must be not only honest, but above the suspicion of dishonesty.

My space forbids more than a brief reference to the discussion of inspiration. On this subject Professor McGarvey proceeds on lines of his own, and is to be distinctly commended for his scriptural as distinguished from the dogmatic treatment of the subject. There are not wanting fresh and suggestive hints, and here and there he seems to be on the point of emerging into a broad and vital apprehension of the central reality which, as it differentiates the fact, should dominate our statement and treatment of inspiration. Thus on the differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint in New Testament citations, he judiciously remarks, after giving some examples: "In all these instances the writers followed the version which they constantly read, without knowing perhaps that it differed from the Hebrew, just as scholars at the present day often quote from our English version without stopping to inquire whether it is accurate or not. Even if Luke, Stephen, or Paul had stopped to inquire which text was correct in the places cited, it is not at all probable that they could have decided the question by their unaided powers. It is clear that the Holy Spirit could have guided them, as it did other writers in other instances, to follow the Hebrew instead of the Greek text; and it follows from the fact that he did not, that he desired the facts to be stated as the people read them in their Bibles, rather than to raise questions of textual criticism among a people unprepared for such investigations." An extension of the logic of that passage is almost all that would be needed to meet the objections to "the essential theory" of inspiration, of which, however, his statement is hardly adequate, any more than the refutation is conclusive.

Making due allowance for such limitations and exceptions as have been noted, it remains to say that the author has executed the task which he has set before himself with conscientious thoroughness and acuteness. He also shows throughout a commendable spirit of candor, fairness in the statement of the difficulties to be removed, an earnest desire to ascertain the truth, as well as zeal in maintaining it. It may also be granted without reserve that in many particulars the discussion is satisfactory, the solution of difficulties reasonable, and the answer to objections conclusive.

A careful index would have much added to the value of the book as a manual for instruction.

LL. J. EVANS.

LANE SEMINARY, CINCINNATI.

HEGEL'S LOGIC. A Book on the Genesis of the Categories of the Mind. A Critical Exposition. By WILLIAM T. HARRIS, LL.D., United States Commissioner of Education. (German Philosophical Classics for English Readers and Students.) Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 1890. 16mo, pp. xxx., 403.

Idealism, considered as the attempt to develop philosophically the insight that the world is constituted by mind, and not by atoms or blind force, is unquestionably "the truth" or inner principle of the history of European speculation. Hegelianism is, in a sort, the culmination of this movement. What others had succeeded in showing imperfectly Hegel undertook to demonstrate. He sought to deduce scientifically the necessity of conceiving the ultimate principle as spiritual, and of the world as its manifestation. His aim was not merely to assert the identity of subject and object, but to comprehend its possibility. Every partial idealism was to be transcended and objective and absolute idealism forever established—an idealism not rising to the clouds by suppressing experience, but keeping firm footing in the world by comprehending it. The common opinion now is that Hegel failed. His "identities," it is said, are merely analogies. His logical "negativity," the *nisus* of the dialectic, is only "negatively related" to real opposition. His *a priori* deductions are borrowed from experience. His "ballet of notions" does not represent the actual play of living energies in the world. This and much more is objected by many who have studied Hegel; what is said against him by those who have not would fill volumes. Meanwhile his system remains, the most imposing monument of pure speculation ever constructed by the mind of man. Its attractions are perennial. So are its difficulties.

Dr. Harris has both studied Hegel and believes in him. He has already done more than any other man in this country to make Hegel understood. And it has been pre eminently a labor of love. "Philosophy bakes no bread." He has chosen for his exposition here the most difficult part of the system, the metaphysical groundwork. The result is a very serviceable chart of the whole system, together with much needed help in detail in the interpretation of Hegel's provokingly elusive thought and exasperating terminology. That Dr. Harris always interprets his author correctly would probably be allowed by no independent student of Hegel besides Dr. Harris himself. The candid critic will, however, concede much to the obscurity of the subject. The five chapters (iv.–viii.) analyzing the *Phenomenology*—an awful labyrinth even to the most resolute of readers—should prove especially valuable. So, too, should the analysis of Hegel's "Begriff" (c. xiii.), which, in its distinction from the "Idea," is regarded as "the most important aperçu" of the logic (p. x.). All the vexed questions of metaphysics come up for discussion, and there is no possibility of making the discussion easy. Attention may be called especially to the chapters relating to the finite and the infinite (xvii.–xxi.) and to that on the syllogism (xxx.), as containing the results of much independent thinking.

The most important divergence from Hegel regards the doctrine of the Trinity. It is represented as follows: Hegel thinks that nature is the direct object of the absolute; in reality it is mediated through the consciousness of the Logos, and is, metaphysically considered, the *processio* of the Holy Spirit (p. xiv. f., chap. i.). But Dr. Harris does not make his doctrine intelligible. His identification of the consciousness of the Logos of his "eternal generation" and distinction from the Father with the creation of time and space is arbitrary. And so with all subsequent stages of the process of the "return" to self-consciousness. The wealth of individual existences is unaccounted for, even if we allow the reality of the universals. The world cannot be deduced that way. The dialectical development of the categories may be conceivable; the derivation of individuality and sensuous matter from pure thought, never. In proposing such a construction, we pass over from insight to dogma.
H. N. Gardiner.
Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

A Brief Commentary on the Books of the New Testament for Study and Devotion. By F. W. Stellhorn, Professor of Theology in Capital University, Columbus, O. Vol I. The Gospels. Columbus: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1891. 8vo, pp. xi., 348. Cloth, $2; half leather, $2.50; morocco, $3.

This exposition is intended both for the clergy and the laity, to aid the former in searching the Scriptures, and the latter in conducting household worship. These two objects are not often combined in the same work, and the author's preface suggests a doubt whether at times one has not been sacrificed to the other. It seems to us that he has succeeded as well as could be expected. His method is to take a longer or shorter pericope, which is printed at length from the Common Version, and follow it by a summary explanation, critical remarks on words and phrases being given in the shape of notes at the bottom of the page. At the close of each chapter is a collect or short prayer, breathing the true spirit of humble, earnest devotion.

The explanations are in the main sensible and evangelical, yet might have been more satisfactory without encroaching upon the prescribed limits. For instance, the reader is not told that the phrase, often recurring in the fifth chapter of Matthew, "It was said by them of old time," should be rendered "*to* them of old time." Thus one misses a number of the nicer points of exposition which are now substantially settled. But so far as the author does go, his remarks are both correct and useful. He is faithful to the standards of his own church, insisting (p. 111), in regard to the institution of the Eucharist, that "only he who comes to these words with the preconceived notion that it is not possible for Christ to give His body to eat and His blood to drink, will understand them in any other than the literal sense" All the rest of the Protestant world are of a different opinion. It is proper to add that Dr. Stellhorn, commenting upon the strong expressions in John vi. 58, declares that the eating and drinking here spoken of cannot be that which takes place in the Lord's Supper (1) because Christ makes it necessary to salvation (v. 53), and (2) because He represents it as always and necessarily salutary (v. 54); neither of which can be said of the partaking of the supper, while both can and must be said of the appropriation of Christ's vicarious life and death by faith. This is certainly very well put.

On the whole, the work will prove itself an acceptable addition to the popular expositions of the Word, especially to the people of the large and influential Lutheran body. It will be completed in two similar octavo volumes, one comprising Acts, Romans, and Corinthians, the other the rest of the New Testament.
T. W. Chambers.
New York.

Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals. By Malcom MacColl, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon and Rector of St. George's, city of London. New York: James Pott & Co., 1890. [Third edition.] Pp. liv., 346, $1.75.

It becomes necessary, every now and then, in the progress of theology, as well as of any other science, to take a survey of the existing situation and see what have been the absolute gains. This gives rise to two classes of literary work—one endeavoring to weave into a consistent whole the elements of the science, in a new and improved manner, and which is necessarily *ad clerum—i.e.*, intended for those who follow everything back to first principles more or less persistently; and the other *ad populum*, in which the endeavor is to make the same apprehensible for the common mind by clear statement and appropriate illustrations. This work is of the latter class, and its content was originally in the form of lectures delivered before the congregation of Ripon Cathedral.

Both these classes of works have their apologetic worth for their different classes of readers. This present book, therefore, cannot be said to have organic completeness, and may seem fragmentary. Indeed, even for his immediate auditors there is one hiatus which ought to have been filled up. In vindicating the doctrine of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit, as a necessity of thought, or even His revealed relation to Father and Son, does not receive the needful treatment; and hence His office in the economical relations of the Christian Church cannot be made out.

But for its immediate content and within its range this book is eminently successful. The author is an accomplished writer, makes his meaning very clear, and illustrates it felicitously from admitted facts of science and history. His mind is evidently open to all new truth, and unclouded by any bigotry. Hence he is not given to overstatement or to needless dogmatism, and yet he vindicates the need of dogma by showing that wrong conceptions in theology inevitably bring about results in human *character* which are abnormal. The fundamental postulates of theology are presented in very attractive form, and it is made clear that the tendency of all the great heresies was to narrow, not enlarge, the extent of Christian belief, and that the creeds were protests against such diminution. In a very interesting way he demonstrates that there has been a Providential guiding in human progress, and that unless a certain degree of moral and religious attainment had preceded the great discoveries of physical science, the latter would have been destructive to human welfare.

In treating of the question of the miraculous conception of Jesus, he notices the analogies which science presents, but we cannot think that he deals satisfactorily with the doctrine of the Person of Christ. It is not noticed that even in His descent from the female parent he must have received *soul-determinations*. The doctrine of the new *creation* may be held so abstractly as to do injustice to the doctrine of *traduction*, and that our Lord was a true member of the human race, even though born *into* it, rather than *out of* it. We think, too, that the need of Christ's *death* is not clearly enough displayed to lift the doctrine of Atonement beyond the charge of arbitrariness. Jesus' death, though voluntary, was yet necessary. That He could suffer *pain* showed that he *must* die.

It is to be hoped that the author will supplement these lectures by others, giving the whole more satisfactory completeness.

J. Steinfort Kedney.
Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minn.

Brief Reviews, by the Editor.

Theologischer Jahresbericht. Herausgegeben von R. A. Lipsius. Zehnter Band enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1890. Erste Abtheilung: *Exegese;* bearbeitet von *Carl Siegfried* und *H. Holtzmann.* (Braunschweig: Schwetschke; New York: Gustav E. Stechert, 1891, pp. 1–116.) Truly the worth of this volume is great to those to whom it has any worth at all. It is an attempt to get together a large number and as complete a collection as possible of the titles of books, pamphlets, and review articles upon subjects belonging to the various branches of theological science. With them are coupled short incisive notices of many of the books mentioned in the lists. The brevity of many notices is sometimes provoking, but as they are made by acknowledged authorities in the various branches, one is enabled to get a fair idea of a book or article. One limitation is to be noted, that the critics have not seen all of the books in the list. But despite this, the classified catalogue is of great assistance, and enables one to look up a large part, if not the whole, of the literature of the year in very brief time. The continuation of the series to the tenth volume is a fair guarantee of its usefulness and value. The present *Abtheilung* covers Exegetical Theology in all its parts, beginning with the philological aids and proceeding to the text, criticism, and exegesis of both Old and New Testaments. The following parts are to cover the other three main heads in the fourfold division of Theological Encyclopædia. It is worthy of note that the mention of American books and review articles is very full.

Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah. The Warburton Lectures for 1880–84, with two appendices on the arrangement, analysis, and recent criticism of the Pentateuch. By *Alfred Edersheim,* M.A., Oxon., D.D., Ph.D. Author's Edition. (New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., pp. xxiv., 391.) This is a reprint of the twelve lectures published soon after the delivery of the last one, and apparently from the original plates. It does not seem necessary to say anything further about the book at this late day, than that the author's position is mainly opposed of that of Wellhausen and Kuenen. A considerable part of the volume is taken up with a refutation of their positions upon the Pentateuchal and other historical questions as to the Old Testament. Recognizing, however, that it is in the nature of things that criticism will clear away in some cases the alleged foundations of some of our traditional beliefs, the author says: "For the end is certain—not that full and free criticism may be suppressed, but that it may be utilized; that so on the evening of the battle there may be assured peace, and the golden light shine around the old truth in her new garments of conquest, revealing the full perfection of her beauty."

The Fleming H. Revell Company of New York and Chicago have continued their "Popular Vellum Series" by the addition of three neat little pamphlets (16mo, 32 pages each, 20 cents). The new issues are *The Fight of Faith and the Cost of Character*: Talks to Young Men, by *Theodore L. Cuyler,* D.D.; *Hope, the Last Thing in the World,* by *Arthur T. Pierson,* D.D.; and *How to Learn How:* Addresses—I. Dealing with Doubt; II. Preparation for Learning, by *Henry Drummond,* F.R.S.E., F.G.S. They are just what one would expect them to be, and are beyond praise.

QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

CONTENTS PAGES AND DIGESTS OF THEIR PRINCIPAL ARTICLES.

Criticism versus Ecclesiasticism. I. Criticism. By Rev. Stewart Means. *Andover Review,* September, 1891.

This is the first paper of a full and clear exposition of the two tendencies or modes of thought which are becoming more and more evident as controlling the active spirits of the day. The old parties and schools, the author claims, are disappearing, and the lines of a new conflict are becoming apparent, with new standards, new weapons, and new battle cries.

Taking up, first, criticism, the author treats it historically, to prove his position that it can only be called modern in the sense that it is a great force in modern thought. In reality it is as old as Protestantism and the intellectual movement resulting in and expressed by the Reformation. That intellectual ferment aroused in Italy chiefly the love for classical studies; but in Germany it could only be contented with applying itself to the most serious and religious thought and study. For a long time its contest was most difficult. Its most ardent and successful scholars—Reuchlin, Erasmus, Budæus—were rejected by the universities which were in the power of the Church, and controversy too often took the place of scholarship, to the great sorrow of Melanchthon and Luther. Still the leaders accomplished much, and were nobly followed by Scaliger and Casaubon, who enlarged upon the scholarship of Erasmus by adding the power of the critic. During this time scholarship was exclusively Protestant, but with less and less enthusiasm. Then came Bentley, with his claim that criticism could be a science, and be worked independently of tradition or prejudice, and could lead to results which could be tested by the severest rules of evidence. It is interesting that the work of Tischendorf, nearly one hundred and fifty years later, was based upon the method outlined by Bentley.

The influence of Bentley was felt most of all in Germany, where Lessing, Herder, and Goethe filled the land with new activity, and Kant inaugurated the great speculative and philosophical movement which has changed the theology and philosophy of the century. It was necessary that criticism should have something to criticise, and hence the value of the impulse given by Wolf and Niebuhr to the study of the ancient civilization. Investigation became the order of the day, and it was natural that the great world of Hebrew history should be drawn within its scope. The keynote of the great problem of Old Testament criticism—the Pentateuch—was struck as early as 1753 by Jean Astruc, a Frenchman; but the greatest impulse was given by De Wette. Dr. Arnold's desire for some one to do for Judea "what Wolf and Niebuhr had done for Greece and Rome" was in great measure filled by the great work of Ewald, which still stands without a rival in the field which it covers.

Next followed New Testament criticism, and the study of the Canon started by De Wette and carried on by Bretschneider, Gieseler, Schleiermacher, and the great founder of the Tübingen school, Ferdinand Christian Baur, who, whatever may be thought of his conclusions, did more than any single writer to place the science of historical criticism and church history on a solid basis. The immediate effect, however, was to produce something very like a revolution in theology. It is significant that the appearance of Strauss's "Leben Jesu" in 1835, marking the critical period of modern German theology, was preceded by two years by the publication in England of the first of the famous "Tracts for the Times." Thus both the body and form of the religious life and the foundation and science of the Christian faith were assailed at the same time.

At first the new school swept all before it; but after a time the tide turned, the conservative scholars began to gain the advantage, and some of the most important positions of the once-triumphant school were overthrown on the basis of investigations just as bold and careful and less prejudiced. The general result has been a great change and shifting in the views of theological opponents and the means used to defend them. Many of the positions held by the Tübingen school are held now, at least in part, by their opponents.

The new movement is by no means merely temporary or local, but includes the whole field of theology. It is not novel, but is a part of the noblest traditions of Protestantism. That it has come forward so recently is due to the fact that only recently has it acquired its materials in revised texts, old documents, inscriptions, etc. The idea of studying an organism not merely in its members, but in its associations, especially those from which it has absorbed its best power and life, has only recently developed, even in science, and its application to the history of the early Church excites with many unfeigned dislike and opposition. This will yield, for theological prejudice and ecclesiastical tradition have nothing to do with strict scientific criticism, whose one purpose is to discover the meaning of the Bible and the Fathers, without reference to any other claims but those of truth. Unquestionably there have been blunders, but no more than in other branches of scientific research.

Looking at some of the chief results reached, the following are noticed: First, the position and character of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments have been much changed. The Bible stands out more clearly as a rich and beautiful picture of the past, in which there is everywhere present a divine purpose and presence such as are not absent from every man's own personal experience to-day, and is more a living book to-day than at any time since the sixteenth century. Another result is the establishment of the new science, or department of theological study, called Biblical Theology, which aims to find the point of view of each different book and section of the Bible as distinct from that theology which prepares its system and then seeks authorization from the Scriptures. In connection with this, in the field of dogmatics the influence of the critical movement has been most pronounced and most effective. The various systems, from the Alexandrians of the third century to the Tractarians of the nineteenth, have passed before the eye of the historical critic, who has gathered from them whatever of valuable contribution they have, and has shown that no one generation can do the thinking for every other—that each must do its own.

As a conclusion, the writer claims that the critical spirit represents the higher intellectual attitude of Protestantism as opposed to the ecclesiasticism of Romanism, and will carry its life with it, because it is moving in the path of right reason and science.

IMMIGRATION: A SYMPOSIUM. *Methodist Review*, September–October, 1891.

Recognizing that the subject is somewhat unwelcome, yet realizing its importance, three prominent writers—Rev. Charles Parkhurst, D.D., of Boston, Mass., Rev. W. H. Wilder, D.D., of Bloomington, Ill., and Professor G. L. Curtiss, D.D., of Greencastle, Ind.—discuss in a terse, practical way the value of immigration, its evil, and the duty of the Church and the nation toward it.

With regard to its value, Dr. Parkhurst calls attention to the fact that this is a land of immigrants; claims that restriction is imperative, that race prejudice is unchristian, and declares himself an optimist as to the effects of immigration. He bases his position on three points: 1. Immigration very greatly increases the material wealth and productive power of the nation, instancing Mr. Carnegie's "Triumphant Democracy" and Rev. Dr. Josiah Strong's "Our Country" in proof. 2. Immigration develops the qualities which make for a free republican government, and instances are given of many who have been prominent in our history—Ericsson, Agassiz, Philip Schaff, William M. Taylor, Carl Schurz, Andrew Carnegie. 3. Immigration has a marvellous value in the moral uplift and evangelization of all peoples, especially where it is to a Christian land, and when it meets a Christian ideal.

Dr. Wilder discusses the evil of immigration, laying stress upon the enormous rate of increase of foreign population, bringing with it Sabbath desecration, social discontent, illiteracy, pauperism, insanity and crime, and ignorance and carelessness of our ideas or forms of government. He claims that the quality of immigration has greatly deteriorated, having become largely involuntary and mercenary instead of voluntary and prompted by an ethical motive, and that instead of spreading itself through the country in such way as to be more readily assimilated, it collects in the cities, where it becomes the tool of designing men. Another danger lies in the clannish and colonizing tendencies that are manifested when communities speaking another tongue and careless of the language of the country meet and fraternize with little regard for the general interests or welfare. The last mentioned but not the least evil in the matter is that blind and fatal optimism so characteristic of the American people.

Professor Curtiss, taking up the question of the duty of the nation and the Church, takes up four points: 1. The character of the immigration has greatly deteriorated from what it was thirty to forty years ago. 2. The Government has a perfect right to restrict immigration and refuse to accept those as residents and citizens who utterly disregard its authority or the interests of the people. 3. The Government not only has the right, but is in duty bound to regulate the conduct of foreigners resident within her borders. Especially has it a right to restrict their purchase of American land, their absorption of American capital, and may compel them, if they refuse to become citizens, to leave the country and give up their property. 4. The duty of the Church toward the four classes of immigrants: (1) the infidel, sceptic, and rationalist; (2) the careless, indifferent, and debauched; (3) the dupes of Romanism, who hold allegiance to a foreign religious-politico (*sic*) power on the banks of the Tiber; (4) a few good, sober, intelligent, industrious foreigners conscientiously seeking a home where they can better their condition. These last are to be met with open arms. In general the duty of the Church is: 1. To make a united effort to break the power of Romanism over the immigrants, so that they will not be moved as by machinery to interfere in the public schools and in the various branches of the government. 2. To compel through every State the children of immigrants to an attendance upon American schools, and be educated as Americans. 3. The churches must unite in some system of missionary work to foreign populations in America that will reach and touch them all with the spirit of Christ. 4. Sufficient church accommodation must be secured so that foreigners may have suitable places for attending divine worship. This discussion, it is believed, will lead to two good results: 1. More stringent laws regarding immigration, alienation, and naturalization. 2. More careful and prayerful consideration of the duty of the churches to the immigrants.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF LEADING ARTICLES.

The Andover Review, Sept., 1891.

"Criticism *versus* Ecclesiasticism." See above.

"The Challenge of Life," by Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, of Brooklyn, N. Y., is a discussion of the milder form of pessimism, especially as set forth by Edouard von Hartmann, whom the writer calls the Elisha of the pessimistic philosophy, as Schopenhauer might be considered its Elijah. After setting forth Hartmann's idea that the ultimate end of the world-process is happiness, which, however, can only be realized through painlessness, which must involve annihilation, some of the current answers of optimism, moderate meliorism, and utilitarianism or hedonism are considered and disposed of, and the conclusion is reached that the challenge involved in Hartmann's question, "What, then, to do with this life; with what substance of inner worth is it to be filled?" can only be answered by faith in the God of our life, a God of right and duty.

The article is valuable as setting forth in somewhat popular form ideas that are generally but vaguely understood.

"Apollonius of Rhodes and the Argonautica," by Professor Charles J. Goodwin, is a literary-historical study of one of the best of the Alexandrian poets, who lived in the third century after Christ, and who have been little known or studied.

"Some Experiments Worth Trying in the Ministry," by Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, of Topeka, Kan. In this short and interesting article Mr. Sheldon gives some of the results of his efforts to keep up such "variety and freshness in the work of his profession" as will "clothe old things with a new garment." Special stress is laid upon the absolute necessity for every man and every minister of self-development, especially in view of the constant drain on sympathy, intellect, spiritual forces, time, and physical energy. One solution is found in mapping out the year's work in a sort of Outlook, covering the Church-membership, Sunday-school, Week-day Service, Sermon, Parish Visiting, etc., and giving to each special attention for some one section—perhaps one month of the year. Objections and advantages are clearly given. Another experiment tried with success is to secure the assistance of the congregation in gathering materials for sermons, utilizing whatever specialists may be found on different topics. Again an effort has been made to find out accurately the standpoint of other men, particularly as it is affected by their occupations or surroundings—be for the time being, so far as is practicable, a clerk, carpenter, etc. The writer quotes George Macdonald's remark, "To try too hard to make people good is one way to make them worse," etc., and emphasizes his belief that methods and experiments are but means to an end, and that the secret of success lies in the truth that the new creature in Christ Jesus is the whole man expanded in all possible ways, and winning other men to the same life which the Master said He came to bring to the world "more abundantly." A good, suggestive, practical article.

"A New Chain," by Rev. M. McG. Dana, D.D., of Lowell, Mass., is a plea for the better study of the problems of social science, especially in its relation to the Gospel of Christ. Courses of lectures on the subject, as given in the theological seminaries, do not furnish the opportunity for that careful study which every minister should give to the ethical problems he must meet in his daily ministrations. "The social problem is the field on which the decisive battle of Christianity must be fought," and the ministry should be armed to meet the conflict.

The whole number, including the editorial notes on a Benefit of the Higher Criticism, Recent Speculation in Canada, the International Congregational Council, James Russell Lowell, and the General View of India Missions, is exceptionally interesting and valuable.

The Methodist Review, Sept., Oct., 1891.

"The Gospel According to Mark," by Rev. F. W. Bristol, D.D., of Chicago, Ill., is a critical study of the Gospel, giving some of the results of the latest investigations.

"Immanuel—Prediction, Content, Fulfilment," by Professor W. W. Martin, of Vanderbilt University, is a study of Isaiah vii. 14, 15, especially in connection with an article by Professor H. G. Mitchell, of Boston, in the *Andover Review* for April, and taking the ground that Matthew, in quoting the verses, was unquestionably right in saying that they referred to Christ.

"Immigration: A Symposium," is more fully treated above.

"A Psychological Principle in Revelation," by Rev. J. W. E. Bowen, D.D., of Washington, D. C., takes the position that, as history is essentially a psychological science, the study of the historic manifestation and apprehension of religion is essentially a psychological study of the race. Thus the apprehension of religion is a process of growth depending upon the psychological growth of man; and thus we see that retrogression has alternated with progression just as in civilization and in science men have not always advanced by a direct route.

"The Kingdom of God," by Rev. B. F. Crary, D.D., of San Francisco, discusses the relation of the term to modern ideas; speaks of it as primarily a spiritual kingdom, but also as having an outer visible government. After considering some of its various aspects, the claims of different denominations to a special relation to it are briefly discussed, a very modest though earnest claim being made for Methodism.

"Regeneration," by Rev. James Douglas, D.D., of Pulaski, N. Y., is a distinctively theological article on the mechanical and vital theories of regeneration.

The Unitarian Review, Sept., 1891.

"The Peace of the Church," by William Everett, is a review of the "Bohlen Lectures," delivered in Philadelphia by Rev. W. R. Huntington, D.D., rector of Grace Church, N. Y. Those lectures were in defence of the propositions made in Chicago in 1886 and ratified at Lambeth in 1888 for a general union of all denominations on the basis of the Scriptures, the Apostles' Creed, the two Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate. While recognizing to the full Dr. Huntington's ability and sincerity, the position is taken that his aim is impracticable, and that he shows marked ignorance of the other branches of the Church.

"Notes on Buddhism at Home," by George R. Mathews, is not so much an exposition of the religion as a series of suggestions or hints as to its relations to the life of the people, gathered from a considerable reading of the best books on the subject.

"Anti-Slavery: A Reminiscence," by the editor, Joseph Henry Allen, is another contribution of the kind furnished by Rev. Dr. A. P. Peabody in the *Andover Review* of August. Chatty and pleasant.

"The Higher Individualism," by Nicholas P. Gilman, is a plea for the putting forth of individual efforts to meet the social difficulties of the day. He claims that thus individual efforts would accomplish more than the general socialistic movement to relieve distress, and would be far more helpful in developing that higher grade of personal character without which general legislation will amount to nothing, since no advance is permanent which is not based on reformed individuals. The idea of State or governmental ownership or supervision is dependent for its efficacy largely upon attendant circumstances. What will do in one country will be of no avail in another. The relations of employer and employé are much the same anywhere, and are dependent upon the development of the higher character in each.

"A Reconstruction of the Apostolic Age" is an effort to weave the results of the historical criticism started by Baur into a brief connected statement.

The New Englander and Yale Review for September has two interesting literary articles on "English Lexicography," by Professor T. W. Hunt, of Princeton, and "A Study of Browning's Dramas," by Miss I. M. Street, of Ann Arbor, Mich.; a medical article on "Dying," by Dr. E. P. Buffet, taking the position that "what is significantly the agony of death may be presumed to be purely automatic, and therefore unfelt:" "The Genesis of Spatial Sensation," by E. Victor Bigelow, is a discussion of the causes of sensation. "German Socialism" is a translation of an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, dealing with both the economic and political doctrines.

The Homiletic Review, Sept., 1891.

"The Pentateuchal Discussion—Present Outlook," by Professor E. C. Bissell, states the two opposing theories, and discusses certain points brought out more recently by those who claim the development theory. 1. They either quietly ignore or openly flout supernaturalism in the Bible and a revealed religion, notwithstanding that they find difficulty in fitting their theory to accepted facts. 2. The complexity of the theory and the obscure and intricate processes by which it is supported are becoming more and more apparent. 3. Its past history shows no real growth. 4. The present disagreements between its advocates makes them unsafe guides. 5. Effects of the analysis proposed are destructive in the extreme in the matter analyzed and the rest of the Bible. 6. Its chief supports fail under adequate tests.

"The Homiletical Value of Church History," by Rev. R. C. Hallock, Ph.D., claims that church history is: 1. A legitimate source of sermon material, as instanced by its use in the Bible; 2. Has great treasures (1) in illustrative material; (2) as an instrument of doctrinal instruction; (3) in eloquent themes; (4) in means of Church loyalty; (5) in its profit to the preacher himself.

"The Religious Paper and the Ministry," by Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D., is a general discussion of the true relation that should obtain between the two, warning the minister against the general and natural dictation of the religious paper.

"On What Line may all the Enemies of the Saloon Unitedly do Battle?" is a symposium. E. E. Hale, D.D., takes the position that if all, without raising the question of the right or wrong of a single glass of wine, would unite in this fight against an open bar, they would succeed; but he has little hope that they will do so.

Herrick Johnson, D.D., claims that the prohibitionists are willing—at least the majority—to unite on such a basis, provided that be the one main thing that all shall unite in striving for, letting all else be subordinate.

"Scripture Interpretation," by James Mudge, D.D., is the first part of a discussion of the principles that should rule in that study.

The Missionary Review of the World, Sept., 1891.

"The Coming Age of Missions" is an editorial article by Rev. Dr. A. T. Pierson, setting forth his conception of the needs and characteristics of the missionary enterprise of the next century. The one word that is to characterize the work is ENTERPRISE. Each church is to be a distinctively missionary church with a double pastorate—one at home and the other abroad. Among suggested enterprises are: a great society for regions beyond, to do the exploring and arranging for the churches of their fields of work; a pioneer bureau for the aid and instruction of new missionaries; a great education and sustentation scheme for the training of missionary candidates on the field; a missionary transportation society; a great society for Christian literature; godly women representing the Church on mission boards, etc.

"The Faith Element in Missions," by Rev. Dr. A. J. Gordon, is an excellent article, considering in a calm, dignified, practical way the relations that faith sustains to the work of missions in securing the needed men, who must be pre-eminently men of the Holy Spirit; the needed money, without taking so much counsel of "business methods" as to forget that Christ is Chief Treasurer as well as Chief Bishop; the needed methods, not forgetting that we may expect miraculous help. Numerous instances under each head are cited. The article is timely and suggestive.

"Missions the True Prayer-Gauge," by Rev. Chauncey T. Edwards, Coudersport, Pa., discusses answers to prayer, especially as exemplified in the history of missions, and followed by a plea for a Prayer Union, by J. Sadler, of London.

"Mohammed and Mohammedanism," by Rev. Henry Rice, of Madras, India, is a study of that subject from the India standpoint, in some respects quite different from that of Arabia, Turkey, or Africa.

"The White Fields" is a sketch of the foreign work of the Foreign Sunday-School Association, by A. Woodruff, Esq., its president.

The International Department, conducted by Rev. Dr. J. T. Gracey, is chatty, covering a number of interesting topics.

The Monthly Concert of Missions covers Persia, Arabia, Turkey, Mohammedanism, and the Greek Church.

The Old and New Testament Student for September furnishes some suggestive articles, especially "Religious Instruction in the Public Schools of Scotland and England," by James B. Reynolds, B.D.; "A Study of New Testament Precedent," by Rev. A. S. Carman, taking up the temporal, local, ethnic, personal, and spiritual limitations, and "The Study in the Gospel of John," by W. S. Harper and G. S. Goodspeed.

The general character of the articles, however, is suggestive of work to be done by somebody else rather than satisfactory by its own completeness.

The Expositor, London, Sept., 1891.

"Dr. H. H. Wendt, on the Fourth Gospel," by Rev. James Iverach, D.D., is a discussion of the position taken by Dr. Wendt that the source of the Gospel of John was a genuine writing of the apostle, similar in kind to the *Logia* of Matthew, but covering only the last portion of his life. The position itself and its attendant points in regard to the relation to the original of the additions made by followers are examined carefully, and the conclusions drawn that they are untenable.

"The Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles," by Rev. W. Lock, M.A., is a study of the period succeeding the death of Christ, with regard to which we have no documents of certain date, and for which the writer of the Acts seems to have relied upon reports.

"The Resurrection of the Dead," by Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D., "The Aramaic Gospel—the Galilean Dialect," by Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, M.A., are studies, the first exegetical, on 1 Cor. xv. 53–58, and the second linguistic, on the differences in the Synoptic Gospels.

"The Human Splendors—Our Lord's Third Temptation," by Rev. W. W. Peyton, is an effort to set forth the different ideas of splendor current at that time among the different races and nations, notably Greek and Roman, as they would appear to Christ.

The Newberry House Magazine, London, Sept., 1891.

"The Symbolism of the Few Living Creatures," by Rev. G. A. Cobbold, M.A., is a discussion of the relations of the vision in Ezekiel to the Four Gospels, and a study as to which creature represents which gospel.

"Church Progress in America," by Thomas B. Preston, is a historical sketch of the Episcopal denomination in America, dealing in this number especially with the period before the Revolutionary War.

"The Crosier and the Crown," by Rev. Canon Pennington, is a historical sketch of the struggle between the temporal and spiritual powers in the eleventh century.

"An Unclassified Class," by Eleanor Holmes, is an appeal for something to be done for the great number of women, especially married women, who do not come under any one of the classes usually helped by societies, and who yet need greatly some assistance, counsel, encouragement; also for those who have lost their virtue, but are not yet by any means irredeemably vicious. The fact that these are so unclassified makes it all the more essential to treat them as individuals. An excellent, timely article.

"Are High Churchmen Disloyal?" by H. Ormonde, gives a number of quotations from noted churchmen, showing that they looked upon the eucharist not only as a sacrament but as a sacrifice, and thus showing that those who now claim this position are not disloyal to the traditions of the Church.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE NEWBERRY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, September, 1891.

The Symbolism of the Four Living Creatures. Rev. G. A. Cebold, M.A.

The More Excellent Way.
Rev. Julian Harvey, M.A.

Church Progress in America. I.
Thos. B. Preston.

The Crosier and the Crown.
Rev. Canon Pennington.

Jacqueline Pascal.
F. Bayford Harrison.

An Unclassified Class.
Eleanor Holmes.

Are High Churchmen Disloyal?
I. What our Great Divines Say.
II. The Eucharistic Sacrifice.
H. Ormonde.

Eminent Churchmen—Rev. T. M. Neale.
Rev. Geo. Huntington, M.A.

THE YOUNG MAN.

London, September, 1891.

A Lucky Hit. Edward Garrett.

The End of the Holidays.
W. J. Dawson.

On the Learning of Languages.
Prof. J. Stuart Blackie.

The Hygiene of Breathing.
A Physician.

The Religious Uses of Hardship.
Rev. Joseph Parker, D.D.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, September, 1891.

Dr. H. H. Wendt on the Fourth Gospel.
Rev. Prof. James Iverach, D.D.

The Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles.
Rev. W. Lock, M.A.

The Resurrection of the Dead.
Rev. Prof. W. Milligan, D.D.

The Aramaic Gospel. The Galilean Dialect.
Rev. Prof. J. T. Marshall, M.A.

The Human Splendors. Our Lord's Third Temptation. Rev. W. W. Peyton.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD.

New York, October, 1891.

The Coming Age of Missions.
Arthur T. Pierson, D.D.

The Faith Element in Missions.
A. J. Gordon, D.D.

Missions the True Prayer League.
Rev. Chauncey T. Edwards.

Mohammed and Mohammedanism.
Rev. Henry Rice.

The American Protestant Orphanage of Broosa. M. Baghdasarian.

The White Fields. A. Woodruff.

Shemmas Meckha of Mosul.
Rev. T. Laurie.

The Brave Mountain Girl.
Rev. John C. Mechlin.

Hassan Botan. Rev. F. G. Coan.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

New Haven, September, 1891.

English Lexicography.
Prof. T. W. Hunt, Princeton, N. J.

A Study of Browning's Poems.
Miss I. M. Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Euthanasia: The Pleasures of Dying.
E. P. Buffet, M.D., Jersey City, N. J.

Genesis of Spacial Sensation.
E. Victor Bigelow, Cambridge, Mass.

German Socialism.
J. Bourdeau, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Translated by J. C. Schweb, Yale University.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., September, 1891.

The Modern Jew and his Synagogue.
Rev. Prof. T. W. Davies, B.D.

Relation of the New Testament to the Mosaic System.
Rev. F. W. C. Meyer.

A Classification of the Solomonic Proverbs.
Kichiro Tonasa, Ph.D.

Religious Instruction in the Public Schools of Scotland and England.
James B. Reynolds, B.D.

A Study of New Testament Precedent. II.
Rev. A. S. Carman.

The Gospel of John.
W. R. Harper and George S. Goodspeed.

General Features of Semitic Religions.
Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Edinburgh, September, 1891.

Notes of Recent Exposition, Klostermann versus Kautzsch and Socin, The Great Text Commentary, etc., and Articles by Rev. Profs. H. E. Ryle, Cambridge; Waddy Moss, Manchester; H. Graetz, D.D., Breslau; George G. Findlay, B.A., and W. T. Lynn, B.A., F.R.A.S.

METHODIST REVIEW (Bi-Monthly).

New York and Cincinnati, September, October, 1891.

The Gospel According to Mark.
Rev. L. M. Bristol, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

Immanuel—Prediction, Content, Fulfilment.
Prof. W. W. Martin, M.A., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Immigration: A Symposium.
Rev. Charles Parkhurst, D.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. W. H. Wilder, D. D., Bloomington, Ill.; Prof. G. L. Curtis, D.D., Greencastle, Ind.

A Psychological Principle in Revelation.
Rev. J. W. E. Bowen, D.D., Washington, D.C.

The Kingdom of God.
Rev. B. F. Crary, D.D., San Francisco, Cal.

Regeneration.
Rev. James Douglas, D.D., Pulaski, N. Y.

The Story of the Resurrection of the Christ.
Rev. William Jones, D.D., Sedalia, Mo.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, September, 1891.

Criticism *versus* Ecclesiasticism. I. Criticism. Rev. Stewart Means.

The Challenge of Life.
Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster.

Apollonias of Rhodes and the Argonautica.
Prof. Charles J. Goodwin.

Some Experiments Worth Trying in the Ministry.
Rev. Charles M. Sheldon.

A New Chair.
Malcolm McG. Dana, D.D.

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW.

Boston, September, 1891.

"The Peace of the Church." A Review.
William Everett.

Notes on Buddhism at Home.
George R. Matthews.

Anti-Slavery: A Reminiscence.
Joseph Henry Allen.

The Higher Individualism.
Nicholas P. Gilman.

Critical Theology: A Reconstruction of the Apostolic Age.

Unitarianism in Ireland.

OUR DAY.

Boston, September, 1891.

The Anti-Opium Resolution in Parliament.
Ex-Pres. Cyrus Hamlin.

Vampire Literature.
Anthony Comstock.

Present Tendencies of American Congregationalism. Prof. L. F. Stearns.

The Pan-Congregational Council in London. Rev. Dr. Joseph Parker.

Boston Hymn · Warp and Woof.
Joseph Cook.

Boston Monday Lecture, 16th Year. General Booth's Great Plan for the Poor. Invited and Uninvited Poverty.
Joseph Cook.

THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

London, September, 1891.

Exegetical Hints on the Old Testament.
Canon Fausset, D.D.

Philosophy and Religion. Part III.
Edward Naville.

The Original Rechabites.
Ernest Bowden.

The Secret of the Epistle to the Hebrews.
A. H. Wratislaw.

Inspired Hebrew Poetry. Part I.
J. Neill.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York, October, 1891.

Clerical Conservatism and Scientific Radicalism. Principal W. Caven, D.D.

The Higher Criticism and the Tombs of Egypt. Egyptology No. VIII.
Rev. Camden M. Cobern, Ph.D.

Richard Rolle, the Hampole Hermit.
Prof. T. W. Hunt, Ph.D., L.H.D.

Popular Misapprehensions of Roman Catholic Doctrine, Polity, and Usage.
Rev. C. C. Starbuck.

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for October has these contents : Frontispiece—"Street in the New Quarter of Cairo"—illustration to "Cairo in 1890;" "Cairo in 1890," by Constance Fenimore Woolson, numerous illustrations after photographs, and from drawings by W. T. Smedley, W. M. Chase, and others—the peculiar attractiveness of Cairo—the climate—mosques—the Gizeh Museum—the bazaars—the Nile—domestic architecture—the pyramids—the Copts—Kief ; "Thy Will be Done" (a poem), by John Hay ; "Letters of Charles Dickens to Wilkie Collins," Part II., edited by Laurence Hutton—familiar correspondence from 1856 to 1861 ; "A Legend of Sonora" (a story), by Hildegarde Hawthorne ; "The Art Students' League of New York," by Dr. John C. Van Dyke, with nine illustrations drawn by pupils of the school—the origin of the League—its history—its purpose and methods—native art—art students abroad ; "Peter Ibbetson" (a novel), Part V., by George du Maurier, with fourteen illustrations drawn by the author ; "Interpreted" (a poem), by Angelina W. Wray ; "An Unfinished Story," by Richard Harding Davis ; "Glimpses of Western Architecture (St. Paul and Minneapolis), III., by Montgomery Schuyler—wonderful growth of the twin cities—characteristic features of their architecture—some remarkable public buildings—church architecture—residential St. Paul—dwellings in Minneapolis—is there such a thing as Western architecture ? "A Courier's Ride," by F. D. Millet, with ten illustrations by the author—narrative of a war correspondent's adventure in Bulgaria in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877 ; "An Imperative Duty" (a novel), Part IV., by William Dean Howells—the conclusion of Mr. Howells's remarkable story ; "Common-sense in Surgery," by Helen H. Gardener, a brief popular paper on some of the recent triumphs of practical surgery ; "London—Plantagenet," III.—the people, by Walter Besant, with ten illustrations drawn by Harry Fenn and H. D. Nichols—foreigners in mediæval London—who were the craftsmen ?—a city of tradesmen—the sports and amusements of the common people—saints' days—festivals—processions—severity of the laws—external splendor of the city ; "Trials of a Painter'sWife," full-page illustration by George du Maurier ; "Editor's Easy Chair," by George William Curtis—the sneer of Cynicus—the press at sea—morality and the playhouse—under a Colonial roof-tree ; "Editor's Study," by William Dean Howells—two rather puzzling books—recent books on Japan ; "Editor's Drawer," conducted by Charles Dudley Warner ; Monthly Record of Current Events (to August 12, 1891).

THE CENTURY for October has these contents : "Portrait of Rudyard Kipling," frontispiece ; "My Last Days in Siberia," George Kennan ; "Was it an Exceptional Case ?" Matt Crim ; "Aërial Navigation"—the Power Required, Hiram S. Maxim ; "Besieged by the Utes"—the Massacre of 1879, Col. E. V. Sumner ; "On a Blank Leaf in 'The Marble Faun,'" Elia W. Peattie ; "A Water Tournament" (play in Provence), Elizabeth Robins Pennell ; "In Answer to a Question," Lilla Cabot Perry ; "The Press and Public Men," Gen. H. V. Boynton ; "An Escapade in Cordova," F. Hopkinson Smith ; "Masks," Richard E. Burton ; "Pro Patria"—In Memory of a Faithful Chaplain, R. W. Gilder ; "The Story of a Story," Brander Matthews ; "The Wood-Maid," Helen Thayer Hutcheson ; "Who was El Dorado ?" Lieut. Henry Rowan Lemly ; "The Robber," James B. Kenyon ; "Italian Old Masters"—Lorenzo di Credi, Perugino, W. J. Stillman ; "Rudyard Kipling," Edmund Gosse ; "Love," William Wilfred Campbell, "Tarrying in Nicaragua"—to California in 1849, letters of Roger S. Baldwin, Jr. ; "Lincoln's Personal Appearance," J. G. Nicolay ; "A Summer Pool," Charles G. D. Roberts ; "The Faith Doctor" (Conclusion), Edward Eggleston ; "Lowell ;" "'The Century' a National Magazine ;" "A Cheap-Money Retrospect;" "Presidential Voting Methods;" "The Key to Municipal Reform;" "James Russell Lowell, Poet and Citizen ;" "Laurels of the American Tar in 1812," H. Y. Powell, E. S. Maclay ; "A Reply to Certain Criticisms," George Kennan ; "What my Clock Says," Nelly Marshall McAfee ; "The Poet Paradox," John Kendrick Bangs ; "Deserving Poor," George Horton ; "To the River St. Lawrence in Autumn," Douglas Sladen.

SCRIBNER'S for October has these contents : "Bear in the Mountains"—frontispiece, "Hunting American Big Game," drawn by A. B. Frost, engraved by Andrew ; "The Corso of Rome," by W. W. Story (the fourth article of the series on the Great Streets of the World), illustrations by Ettore Tito, engraving by Peckwell, Aikman, Miss Powell, Leblanc, and J. Clément ; "The Voices of Earth," by Archibald Lampman ; "The Wrecker"—Chapters VII.–IX., by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne, with a full-page illustration by William Hole ; "Autumn Haze," by R. K. Munkittrick ; "Hunting American Big Game," by Archibald Rogers, illustrations by A. B. Frost ; "C. H. R.—Lost off Haimun in the China Sea," by Julia C. R. Dorr ; "The Actions of Wounded Animals," by J. N. Hall, M.D. ; "In One's Age to One's Youth," by Edith M. Thomas ; "The New Lake in the Desert," by J. W. Powell, Director of the U. S. Geological Survey ; "The Biography of the Oyster," by Edward L. Wilson, illustrations by Carlton T. Chapman, Charles Broughton and J. H. Twachtman, engraving by Aikman, C. I. Butler, Merrill, and Heard ; "Clytie," by Ernst Schottky, with headband and initial by Kenyon Cox ; "A Prayer," by Anne Reeve Aldrich ; "Carlyle's Politics," by Edwin C. Martin ; "Captain Black," by Charles E. Carryl ; "The Point of View"—Imagination and Livelihood—The Caviare Theatre—Laurence Oliphant's Life—Sancta Simplicitas.

LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for October has these contents : "Lady Patty," by The Duchess ; "Healthy Heroines," by Julien Gordon ; "A Tiffin with a Taotai," by Edward Bedloe ; "October," by Florence Earle Coates ; "The Bells of San Gabriel," by Gertrude Franklin Atherton ; "A Minor Chord," by Ella Wheeler Wilcox ; "Dream and Deed," by Katharine Lee Bates ; "The Common Roads of Europe," by John Gilmer Speed ; "Sea-Bird of the Broken Wing," by Roden Noel ; "Sonnet" (upon Courbet's Picture "The Wave"), by R. T. W. Duke, Jr. ; "With Washington and Wayne," by Melville Philips ; "The Lost 'Landfall' of Columbus," by William Agnew Paton ; "Divided," by Helen Grace Smith ; "Humanitarian Hours," by Lilian North ; "Rhymes of Childhood," by R. M. Johnston ; "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading Artists).

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE. The numbers of *The Living Age* for September 12th and 19th contain "The Revival of Quakerism," *Edinburgh ;* "Port-Royal," *London Quarterly ;* "The 'Apology' of Aristides," *Contemporary ;* "The Poet of the Klephts," *Nineteenth Century ;* "The Persecuted Russian Jews," *National ;* "The Anak of Publishers" and "The Congress of Vienna," *Temple Bar ;* "St. Jean de Luz" and "Some Pagan Epitaphs," *Cornhill ;* "Scarron" and "Ignatius Loyola," *Belgravia ;* "The Strange Instincts of Cattle," *Longman's ;* "The Death of Mr. Lowell," *Times* and *Speaker ;* with instalments of "Montes the Matador," "Francesca's Revenge" and "Jeanne Zephir's Lovers," and poetry.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for October, 1891, has these contents : "The House of Martha," XLVIII.-LII., Frank R. Stockton ; "Emily Dickinson's Letters," Thomas Wentworth Higginson ; "The Hawkbit," Charles G. D. Roberts ; "Gran'ther Hill's Patridge," Rowland E. Robinson ; "The Ascetic Ideal," Harriet Waters Preston and Louise Dodge ; "Deep-Sea Springs," Edith M. Thomas ; "In London with Doctor Swift," Henry F. Randolph ; "The Lady of Fort St. John," XIII.-XV., Mary Hartwell Catherwood ; "General George H. Thomas," Henry Stone ; "The Cave-Dwellers of the Confederacy," David Dodge ; "The Equinoctial on the Ipswich Dunes," Frank Bolles ; "The Bubble," John B. Tabb ; "The Late Sir John Macdonald," Martin J. Griffin ; "A People without Law," I., James Bradley Thayer ; "James Russell Lowell, 1819–1891," Oliver Wendell Holmes ; "Ignatius von Döllinger," E. P. Evans ; "Mr. Howells's Literary Creed ;" "Comment on New Books ;" "The Contributors' Club ;" "Mr. Lowell and the *Atlantic.*"

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Andrews, W. Old Church Lore. Hull: Andrews, 1891. Pp. 257, 8vo, 6s.

Aurès, Auguste. Traite de métrologie Assyrienne, ou Étude de la numération et du système métrique assyriens considérés dans leurs détails, dans leurs rapports, et dans leur ensemble. Paris : Rouillon, 1891. Pp. 106, 8vo, 6 fr.

Barrou, L. La Raison et la foi. 3e fascicule. Paris : Sauvaitre, 1891. 8vo, 4 fr.

Bascom, John. The New Theology. New York : Putnams, 1891. Pp. viii., 217, 8vo, $1.50.

Beck, J. T. Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser, nebst Anmerkungen zum Briefe Pauli an die Kolosser. Herausgegeben von Julius Lindenmeyer. Gütersloh : Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. xii., 271, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Bender, August, Pfarrer. Vorträge über die Offenbarung Gottes auf alttestamentlichem Boden mit steter Berücksichtigung der kritischen Forschung. Gütersloh : 1891. Pp. viii., 256, 8vo, 3 mk.

Bible, La. Traduction nouvelle d'après les textes hébreu et grec par E. Ledrain. Tom 7. Œuvres morales et Syriques. I. : Cantique des Cantiques, Ecclésiaste, Proverbes, Sapience, Ecclesiastique, Ruth, Esther, Tobie, Judith. Paris : Lemerre, 1891. Pp. iv., 503, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Bliss, Edwin Munsell, Rev. (ed.). Encyclopædia of Missions. A thesaurus of facts, historical, statistical, geographical, ethnological, and biographical ; with maps, bibliography, and statistical tables. New York : Funk, 1891. 2 vols. Pp. 1340, 8vo, cloth, $12.00.

Bocock, John H., D.D. Selections from the Religious and Literary Writings of ——. With a biographical sketch by C. R. Vaughan, D.D. Edited by his widow. Richmond, Va.: Whittet, 1891. Pp. xxvii., 444, 8vo.

Böttger, H. Das Urchristenthum, aus dem Heiden- und Judenthum durch Christi, des ersehnten Messias, Lehre, Leben, Wirken, Sterben, und Auferstehen entwickelt und begründet. Aus den Urquellen, wie nie zuvor, bewiesen. 2. Auflage. Breslau: Freund, 1891. Pp. xii., 163, 8vo, 3 mk.

Boudignon, J. B., Abbé. L'Encyclique sur la question sociale, avec commentaire historique et littéral. Paris: Lethielleux, 1891. Pp. 115, 8vo, 2 fr.

Bratke, E., Dr. Das Monogramm Christi auf dem Labarum Constantins des Grossen. Jauer: Guercke, 1891. Pp. 19, 8vo, 1 mk.

Burghard, W. Die Gegenreformation auf dem Eichsfelde vom Jahre 1574–1579. II. Theil. Vom Regensburger Kurtage 1575 bis zum Jahre 1579. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. 59, 8vo, 80 pf.

Calvini, Joannis, in novum testamentum commentarii. Ex Calvini operum collectione Brunsvigensi separatim editi. Vol. I. Harmoniæ Evangeliarum. 2 partes. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1891. Pp. x., 1217, 8vo, 6 mk.

Cappelli, V. Sulla persona del Cefa redarguitosi dall' Apostolo Paolo in Antiochia: disquisizione polemica. Milano: Artigianelli, 1891. Pp. 77, 16mo.

Cheyne, Thomas Kelly, M.A., D.D. The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and History of Religion. With an introduction and appendices. Eight lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1889 on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. xxxviii., 517, 8vo, $4.00.

Claravallensis, J. Die falschmünzerische Theologie Albrecht Ritschls und die christliche Wahrheit. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. 200, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Codrington, R. H. Melanesians: Studies in their Anthropology and Folk-lore. Lond.: Oxf. Warehouse, 1891. Pp. 436, 8vo, 16s.

Coerper, Fritz, Pfarrer. Die Auferweckung des Lazarus. Eine biblische Betrachtung. Elberfeld: Buchhandlung der Evang. Gesellschaft, 1891. Pp. 40, 8vo, 30 pf.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum editum Consilio et impensis academiæ litterarum cæsareæ vindobonensis. Vol. XXI. et Vol. XXV., pars 1. Inhalt XXI. Fausti Reiensis præter sermones pseudo-Eusebian. opera. Accedunt Ruricii epistulæ. Recensuit, commentario critico instruxit, prolegomena et indices adjecit A. Engelbrecht. Pp. lxxx., 505, 16 mk. XXV. 1. S. Aurelii Augustini operum sectionis VI. pars 1. De utilitate credendi de duabus animabus contra Fortunatum, contra Adimantum, contra epistulam fundamenti, contra Faustum, ex recensione J. Zycha. Pp. 797, 20.40 mk. Wien: Tempsky, 1891. 8vo, 36.40 mk.

Dalman, Gustaf H. Jesaja 53, das Prophetenwort vom Sühnleiden des Heilmittlers, mit besonderer Rücksicht der synagogalen Literatur erörtert. 2. Ausg. Berlin: Evangel. Vereins-Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. iv., 55, 8vo, 1 mk.

Delitzsch, Franz, D.D. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Authorized translation by the Rev. James Denney, B. D. In two volumes. (Foreign Biblical Library, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL.D.) Vol. 1. New York: Funk, 1891. Pp. vii., 520, 8vo, $2.50.

De Rossi, John Baptist, The Life of ——. Translated from the Italian by Lady Herbert. Introduction on Ecclesiastical Training and the Sacerdotal Life by the Bishop of Salford. Baltimore: Murphy, 1891. Pp. x., 311, 8vo.

Doane, William Croswell, Rt. Rev. I. T. D., LL.D. Addresses to the Graduating Classes of St. Agnes School. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 238, 8vo, $1.25.

Drane, A. T. The History of St. Dominic, Founder of the Friars Preachers. London: Longmans, 1891. 8vo, 15s.

Dreves, G. M. Analecta hymnica medii ævi. X. Sequentiæ ineditæ. Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken. 3. Folge. Leipzig: Reisland, 1891. Pp. 336, 8vo, 10 mk.

Ægidy, M. von. Das einige Christenthum. (Ernste Gedanken; Weiteres und Ausbau; Bericht über die Pfingst-Versammlung, in 1 Band.) Berlin: Bibliog. Bureau, 1891. Pp. 53, 14, 13, 15, 15, 16, 16, 16, 16, 19, 36, 8vo, 2.70 mk.

Elbel, Benjamin, O.S.F. Theologia moralis per modum conferentiarum. Novis curis edidit Irenæus Bierbaum. Pars IV. (Vol. II.). Paderborn: Bonifacius Druckerei, 1891. Pp. v., 437–568, 8vo, 1.50 mk. (I.–VI. 12.15 mk.)

Fey, C. Urtheile Dr. M. Luther's über das Papstthum. Aus seinen Schriften zusammengetragen. Leipzig: Ev. Bund-Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. iii., 50, 8vo, 50 pf.

Friedrich, J. (Maehliss.) Die Unechtheit des Galaterbriefes. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums. Halle a. S.: Kaemmerer, 1891. Pp. 67, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Gailhard, G., Dr. Darwinisme et Spiritualisme. Paris: Perrin, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Gevaert, Aug. Der Ursprung des römischen Kirchengesanges. Musikgeschichtliche Studie. Deutsch von Dr. Hugo Riemann. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1891. Pp. 87, 8vo, 2.80 mk.

Gowen, H. Temperentia. Lond.: Skeffington, 1891. Pp. 79, cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Grætz, H. History of the Jews. Vol. I. From the earliest period to the death of Simon the Maccabee. Philadelphia: Jew. Pub. Soc. of Am., 1891. Pp. 538, 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

Grössel, Wolfgang. Justinianus von Weltz, der Vorkämpfer der lutherischen Mission. (Missionsbibliothek von W. Faber. Nr. 2 und 3.) Leipzig: Akad. Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. iv., 191, 8vo, 2 mk.

Halévy, J. Recherches bibliques. 13e fascicule. Versailles: Cerf, 1891. Pp. 595–634, 8vo.

Hanna, William, D.D. Wars of the Huguenots. New issue. New York: Treat, 1891. Pp. 344, 8vo, $1.00.

Haskell, L., Mrs. The Sweet Story of Old. A Life of Christ for Children of all Ages. With an introduction by the Venerable Archdeacon Farrar, D.D. New York: Dutton, 1891. Pp. 64, 12mo, 50 cts.

Hatch, Edwin, D.D. Overcoming the World, and other Sermons, by the late ——. With biographical notices by his brother. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. xiii., 336, 8vo, $1.50.

Henschel, A. Evangelische Lebenszeugen des Posener Landes aus alter und neuer Zeit. Posen: Decker, 1891. Pp. xxiv., 465, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Historical Evidences of the Old Testament. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1891. Pp. 319, 12mo, $1.00.

[Contents: The Witness of Ancient Monuments to the Old Testament Scriptures, by A. H. Sayce; The Vitality of the Bible, by Rev. W. G. Blaikie; Present State of the Christian Argument from Prophecy, by Principal Cairns; The Origin of the Hebrew Religion, by Rev. Eustace R. Conder; The Bible Tested; or, Is it the Book for To-day and for the World? by Jacob Chamberlain; The Old Testament Vindicated, by the Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D.]

Historical Evidences of the New Testament. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1891. Pp. 323, 12mo, $1.00.

[Contents: Historical Illustrations of the New Testament Scriptures, by Rev. G. F. Maclear; The Christ of the Gospels, a Religious Study, by Rev. Henry Meyer; Ferdinand Christian Baur and his Theory of the Origin of Christianity, and of the New Testament Writings, by Rev. A. B. Bruce; The Religious Value of the Doctrines of Christianity, by Prof. C. M. Des Islets; Unity of Faith a Proof of the Divine Origin and Preservation of Christianity, by the Rev. J. Stoughton; The Evidential Value of the Observance of the Lord's Day, by the Rev. G. F. Maclear.]

Kanponton, Isaac, Rabbi. Der "Gaon von Kastilien," Darke Hagemara. Die Methodologie des babylonischen Talmud. Mit einem Vorwort herausgegeben von J. H. Weiss. (In hebräischer Sprache.) Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. iii., 20, 8vo, 80 pf.

Karte des Nyassagebiets, Ost-Afrika, mit Angabe der vorhandenen Missions- und Handels-Stationen und des Schauplatzes der geplanten Berliner und Brüder-Mission. Berlin: Berl. Evangel. Missionsgesellschaft, 1891. 30 pf.

Kornrumpf, Franz. Die Anfänge der evangelischen Mission in Deutsch Ost-Afrika. Berlin: Missionsgesellschaft, 1891. Pp. 29, 16mo, 10 pf.

Lagarde, Paul de. Mittheilungen. 4. Band. Göttingen: 1891. Pp. 432, 8vo, 12 mk.

Lasserre, Pierre. La crise chretiénne. Questions d'aujourd'hui. Paris: Perrin, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Sermons Preached on Special Occasions. Published by the Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. xii., 380, 12mo, $1.75.

Ludlow, James M. A King of Tyre. A tale of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. New York: Harpers, 1891. Pp. 298, 12mo, $1.00.

Macqueary, Howard, Rev. Topics of the Times. New York: U. S. Bk. Co., 1891. Pp. 238, 12mo, $1.00.

Maggi, Ces. La sacra infanzia di Gesù Cristo secondo i testi greci, tradotti in volgare, con note storiche ed esegetico-morali. Siena: Bernardino, 1890. Pp. xiv., 304, 16mo, 2 l.

Malato, Ch. Révolution chrétienne et Révolution sociale. Paris: Savine, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Martens, W. War Gregor VII. Mönch? Beleuchtung der diese Frage bejahriger herrschaftliche Meinung. Danzig: Homan, 1891. Pp. 52, 8vo, 65 pf.

Mathews, Robert T. Evangelistic Sermons. With an essay on the Scriptural and Catholic Creed of Baptism. Cincinnati: Standard Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. 395, 8vo, $1.50.

Miller, J. R., D.D. Making the Most of Life. New York: Crowell, 1891. Pp. vi., 275, 16mo, $1.00.

Mortet, Victor. Maurice de Sully. Évêque de Paris (1160-1196). Étude sur l'administration épiscopale pendant la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle. Paris: Picard, 1891. 8vo, 8 fr.

Mühe, Ernst. Biblische Merkwürdigkeiten. 4 Bändchen. (Neue Lichtstrahlen in dunkle Bibelstellen.) Leipzig: Böhme, 1891. Pp. viii., 182, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Murr, Joseph, Dr. Was sagt uns Platon vom Jenseits? Des Philosophen Lehre von den letzten Dingen, aus Citaten platonischer Schriften in deutscher Uebersetzung zusammengestellt. Innsbruck: Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1891. Pp. 31, 12mo, 48 pf.

Murray, J. C. An Introduction to Ethics. London: Gardner, 1891. Pp. 411, cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Owen, J. W. The Common Salvation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Notes of a study of Romans i. 17–viii. 39. London: Patherick, 1891. Pp. 250, 8vo, 5s.

Pfleiderer, Otto. Die Ritschl'sche Theologie. Kritisch beleuchtet. Braunschweig: Swetschke, 1891. Pp. viii., 139, 8vo, 4 mk.

Pierling, Père. La Russie et l'Orient. Mariage d'un Tsar au Vatican. Ivan III. et Sophie Paléologue. Paris: Leroux, 1891. Pp. viii., 215, 18mo, 2.50 fr.

Pomeranz, Bernard. La Grèce et la Judée dans l'antiquité. Coup d'œil sur la vie intellectuelle et morale des anciens Grecs et Hébreux. 1. partie. Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. 93, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Posselt, Wilhelm. Der Kaffermissionär. Ein Lebensbild aus der südafrikanischen Mission, von dem Missionar selbst beschrieben und nach seinen Jahresberichten ergänzt, fortgeführt und herausgegeben von E. Pfister und D. Wangemann. 2te Auflage. Berlin: Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. 210, 8vo, 2.25 mk.

Randall, D. A., D.D. The Tabernacle in Sinai. An account of the structure, signification and spiritual lessons of the Mosaic tabernacle erected in the Wilderness of Sinai. Boston: Bradley & Woodruff, 1891. Pp. 420, 8vo, $1.50.

Riemann, O., Dr. Was wissen wir über die Existenz und Unsterblichkeit der Seele? Eine Polemik gegen Dr. Ludwig Büchner's "Das künftige Leben und die moderne Wissenschaft." Magdeburg: Heinrichshofen, 1891. Pp. iv., 47, 8vo, 1 mk.

Robertson, C. G. Cæsar Borgia. The Stanhope Essay for 1891. Oxford: Blackwell, 1891. Pp. 90, 8vo, 2s.

Robins, Henry E., D.D. The Harmony of Ethics with Theology. An essay in revision. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. 100, 16mo, $1.00.

Saalfeld, G. A. De bibliorum sacrorum Vulgatæ editionis græcitate. Quedlinburg: Vieweg, 1891. Pp. xvi., 180, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Sachse, H. Bernardus Guidonis Inquisitor und die Apostelbrüder. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Practica. Rostock: Leopold, 1891. Pp. 58, 8vo, 2 mk.

Sanborn, F. B. Dr. S. G. Howe, the Philanthropist. New York: Funk, 1891. Pp. xiii., 370, 8vo, $1.50.

Sermon Bible. St. Luke i. to St. John iii. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. 414, 12mo, $1.50.

Short Life of the Blessed Peter Aloysius Mary Chanel, Marist Priest and First Martyr of Oceanica. Abbeville: Paillart, 1891. Pp. 32, 18mo.

Smyth, J. P. The Old Documents and the New Bible. A history of the Old Testament for the people. New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 214, 12mo, $1.00.

Stead, W. T. The Pope and Labour. The Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the Condition of Labor, together with Letters from the Vatican, 1889. Lond.: Rev. of Rev. Off., 1891. Pp. 108, 4to, 1s.

Teutschlænder, W. S. Geschichte der evangelischen Gemeinden in Rumänien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Deutschthums. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Rumäniens. Leipzig: Kessler, 1891. Pp. xiii., 243, 8vo, 4 mk.

Tschirn, G. Der Mensch Jesus und das historische Christenthum. Streitschrift wider die theologischen Gegner M. von Egidys. Berlin: Bibliogr. Bureau, 1891. Pp. 91, 8vo, 1 mk.

Voigt, H. G. Eine verschollene Urkunde des antimontanistischen Kampfes. Die Berichte des Epiphanius über die Kataphryger und Quintillianen, untersucht. Leipzig: Richter, 1891. Pp. vii., 351, 8vo, 8 mk.

Vonderhalde, E. Die Göttlichkeit Jesu Christi und der Kampf um die Geistigkeit der Religion. Leipzig: Wigand, 1891. Pp. 108, 8vo, 1 mk.

Weidner, Revere Franklin. A System of Christian Ethics. Based on Martensen and Harless. Philadelphia: Frederick, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 418, 12mo, $2.50.

——. Also Practical Theology. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. iii., 8vo, $1.00. Also Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Vol. II. Part III. The Pauline Teaching. Part IV. The Teaching of John. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. viii., 351, 12mo, $1.50.

Wiegand, Fridericus, Dr. De ecclesiæ notione quid Wiclif docuerit. Dissertatio Theologica. Leipzig: Faber, 1891. Pp. iii., 110, 8vo, 5 mk.

Wise, Isaac M. Pronaos to Holy Writ. Establishing on documentary evidence the authorship, date, form, and contents of each of its books, and the Pentateuch. Cincinnati: Clarke, 1891. Pp. 193, 8vo, $1.50.

Wright, L. Modern Teetotal Heresy at the Lord's Table. With observations on "The Cup of the Lord" as a great temperance question. Bristol: Wright, 1891. Pp. 79, cr. 8vo, 9d.

Zahn, Adolph, D.D. Wanderung durch Schrift und Geschichte. Aus der Zerstreuung gesammelt für Freunde und herausgegeben von einem Freundeskreise. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. xii., 324, 8vo, 3 mk.

CHRONICLE.

August 3. A number of bishops, clergy, and laymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the South met at Sewanee, Tenn., to consider the question of work among the colored people. The gathering was in response to action of the General Conference of 1886. Resolutions were presented expressing the appreciation of the conference of the work of the commission appointed at that time for colored people; expressed the opinion that the appointment of bishops or suffragists was inexpedient, but that archdeacons may be well selected for the special charge of the colored work in the several dioceses; expressed also satisfaction with the efforts made to represent the work in the North, and suggested the propriety of making Hoffman Hall, Nashville, Tenn., the centre of theological education among colored candidates for holy orders.

August 20. The Holy Coat was exhibited at the cathedral of Treves, Prussia, before a large concourse of pilgrims. The exhibition is to continue for two months. The average daily attendance is reported as 40 000.

August 30. A decision was rendered in regard to the long-contested equity suit between the liberal and radical factions of the United Brethren in Christ in the United States, arising out of the adoption of the new constitution of the general conference in 1889. The decision given favored the liberal party, affirming their course to be entirely legal in holding on to the property. The opposing side decided upon making an appeal to the Supreme Court.

Sept. 2. The American Sabbath Union presented a formal protest to the World's Fair Commissioners against the opening of the Fair on Sunday. The Board of Lady Managers subsequently voted 56 to 36 in favor of closing.

Sept. 4. The Catholic Congress in session at Berlin resolve that the time has come for an International Catholic Congress to consider the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. Another congress sitting at Mechlin the following week took similar action.

Sept. 5. The Archbishop of Canterbury gave a decision in the question between Bishop Blyth and the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, which endorsed the position of the Society.

Sept. 15. Dr. Maglagan was consecrated Archbishop of York with imposing ceremonies.

The Wesleyan Methodist Conference, which met at Nottingham, England, during the latter part of August, appointed a special committee, including a large number of the prominent members of the connection, to consider the advisability of applying to Parliament for an act giving the conference liberty of action in regard to the three-year limit of the itinerancy, and to prepare propositions to be submitted to the quarterly meetings through the year. This act is regarded by many as indicating a tendency toward the suppression of the itinerancy as a distinct element in the Wesleyan Church.

There has been considerable discussion in England and also in America during the past month with regard to the course taken by Archbishop Plunkett, of Dublin, in ordaining in his own chapel in Dublin a deacon of the so-called Reformed Episcopal Church of Portugal. Some of the High Church organs oppose the action of the Archbishop as trespassing upon relations of the Church of England to the Roman Catholic Church in Portugal, and also as endorsing certain opinions of the Reformed organization in Portugal, contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England.

The faculty of the Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregational) has been increased by three additions: the Rev. E. T. Harper, Ph.D., who is to lecture on the Old Testament in the light of Assyrian literature and history; the Rev. C. F. Gates, who will give students instruction in city mission work and in the use of the English Bible; and Dr. J. Edward Hermann, who is to have charge of the German department.

There have been continued disturbances more or less serious in China, the most serious being an attack in the city of Ichang on the premises of the Protestant Episcopal mission. No lives were lost, but the property was destroyed.

Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., LL.D., of New York City, will take the place of Rev. Dr. Caspar Wistar Hodge in the work of exegesis at Princeton Theological Seminary, on account of Dr. Hodge's illness.

The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburgh, Pa., opened with the largest attendance in its history, 65 students being present.

Both Andover and Union Theological Seminaries have opened with a largely increased body of students.

OBITUARY.

Barrows. Rev. William, D.D., at Reading, Mass., September 9, 1891, aged 76. Secretary of the Massachusetts Home Missionary Soc., and one of the founders and editors of the *Congregational Review*.

Ganse, Rev. Harvey D., D.D., at Chicago, Sept. 8, 1891, aged 69. He was Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Aid for Colleges.

Lowell, Rev. Robert Traill Spence, D.D., at Schenectady, N. Y., Sept. 12, 1891, aged 74. He was a brother of James Russell Lowell; an Episcopalian clergyman, an author of some note, and a fine scholar.

Olmstead, Rev. John W., D.D., at Manchester, Mass., August 31, 1891, aged 75, for many years editor of the *Watchman*, Boston.

Ward, Ferdinand DeW., D.D., at Clarens, on the shores of Lake Geneva, Switzerland, Aug. 11, 1891. He was for ten years a missionary in India, but for twenty years he was a Presbyterian pastor at Geneseo, N. Y.

CALENDAR.

Oct. 1. General Conference of the Evangelical Association, at Indianapolis, Ind.

Oct. 5. Meeting of the Presbytery of New York to consider the charges against Professor Briggs.

Oct. 7. Œcumenical Methodist Conference, Washington, D. C.

Programme:

Oct. 5. Reception at New York.

Wednesday, *Oct.* 7, Washington. Sermon, Rev. William Arthur, M.A., England; Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Thursday, *Oct.* 8. Topic: Œcumenical Methodism; Present Status of the Eastern Section; Present Status of the Western Section.

Friday, *Oct.* 9. Topic: The Christian Church; its essential unity and genuine catholicity; Christian Unity; Christian Co-operation.

Saturday, *Oct.* 10. Topic: The Church and Scientific Thought; the influence of modern scientific progress on religious thought, the attitude of the Church toward the various phases of unbelief, the Bible in modern criticism.

Monday, *Oct.* 12. Topic: The Church and her Agency; the responsibility and qualification of the creature, the religious press and the religious uses of the secular press.

Tuesday, *Oct.* 13. Topic, continued. The Place and Power of the Lay Agency in the Church, the deaconess movement, Methodist brotherhoods and sisterhoods, woman's work in the Church.

Wednesday, *Oct.* 14. Topic: Education; Religious training and culture of the young, the family, Sunday-school, elementary education, how it may be best promoted, the ethics of elementary education, sectarianism and State education, secondary education, broadest facilities for higher education, the duty of the Church, University education.

Thursday, *Oct.* 15 Topic: Romanism; the present position of Romanism, Romanism as a political power, as a religious power. Topic: Temperance; the Church and the temperance reform, legal prohibition of the saloon.

Friday, *Oct.* 16. Topic: Social Problems; the Church in her relation to labor and capital, the moral aspects of labor combinations and strikes, the moral aspects of combinations of capital, obligations of the Church in relation to the social condition of the people, Christian work among the poor, Christian work among the rich in agricultural districts. Topic: Missions in Heathen Lands; new fields entered since 1881 in Christian lands.

Saturday, *Oct.* 17. Topic: War and Peace; international arbitration.

Monday, *Oct.* 19. Topic: The Church and Public Morality; legal restraint on the vices of society, lotteries, betting, gambling and kindred vices, marriage and divorce laws, the Lord's day, the attitude of the Church toward amusements.

Tuesday, *Oct.* 20. Topic: The Outlook; Christian resources of the Old World, Christian resources of the New World, the Church of the future.

Oct. 13–16. Meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Pittsfield, Mass.

Oct. 14. Consecration of the Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., of Boston, Mass., as Bishop of Massachusetts, at Trinity Church, Boston. Bishop John Williams, of Connecticut, will consecrate; sermon by Bishop Potter, of New York; presenters, Bishops Clark, of Rhode Island, and Whipple, of Minnesota; attending presbyters, the Rev. John Cotton Brooks, of Springfield, Mass., and the Rev. Arthur Brooks, D.D., of New York, brothers of Phillips Brooks. On the evening after the consecration there will be a reception at the house of Rev. S. S. Searing.

Oct. 20. Missionary Council of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, Detroit, Mich.

Oct. 20. Meeting of the American Missionary Association, Cleveland, O.

Oct. 28. Consecration of Rev. I. L. Nicholson, D.D., as Bishop of Milwaukee, at St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia.

Nov. 11. Meeting of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Cleveland, O.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5. NOVEMBER, 1891. No. 2.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

WHY ARE SERMONS DULL?

BY THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS M. CLARK, D.D., LL.D., BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF RHODE ISLAND.

THE remark so often heard, "*It was as dull as a sermon,*" indicates that our pulpit discourses are not always regarded as specially interesting or enlivening. There is no reason, in the nature of things, for a sermon's being dull; on the contrary, the Christian preacher has certain advantages which other classes of public speakers do not possess. He is presumed to deal with matters of the profoundest importance to the hearer; the day appropriated to him is regarded as sacred time, and all other pursuits are suspended to give him an opportunity to be heard; the place in which he speaks is a consecrated spot, and the charms of architecture and music and stately ritual combine to give effect to his words; he is listened to with great outward reverence, and no one ventures to contradict him—not, at least, until the service is over; and yet on every Sunday in the year thousands upon thousands of sermons are preached which are heard—if indeed they are listened to at all—merely from a painful sense of duty.

It is very possible that all these aids and accessories may tend to lower the standard of the pulpit and incline the preacher to regard his sermon as a matter of comparative unimportance. He may think that the religious sense is so quickened by the hallowed associations of the hour, the sanctity of the holy temple, the mellowed prismatic light that streams through the painted windows, the seraphic music and the rich diapason of the organ, the measured tones of prayer, the awful mysteries of the sacrament, as to make the expression of anything that originates with him a matter of inferior moment, and so the sermon is reduced to the minimum, both in its length and its substance. As a general rule, very high ritual and very strong preaching do not readily affiliate.

It is sometimes said that the days of the preacher are numbered. Other agencies have come into being to do the work that was once assigned to the pulpit; new occupations have been found for the Sunday; the multitudinous religious papers and periodicals, supplemented by the daily secular press, are sufficient to keep the public mind informed upon those subjects which were formerly monopolized by the preacher; multitudes of people are glad to escape from the dreary confinement of their stifled habitations and breathe on Sunday the free air of heaven by the open sea, or amid the shady groves—"God's first temples." I was struck by the remark once made to me by the rector of a church in San Francisco, to the effect that it was difficult to secure a good congregation in that city on a pleasant Sunday, while he could rely on an excellent attendance upon a rainy day.

It is impossible for us to comprehend the feeling which stimulated our Puritan ancestors to sit quietly hour after hour, with the thermometer at zero, listening to elaborate metaphysical discourses, which would seem to us as dry and profitless as a table in logarithms; and yet there has never been a period when there was so much to incite the preacher of Christ's Word to do his best in the pulpit as there is now. The popular interest in science and art and literature can never make men oblivious of those matters which pertain to the soul and its destiny. Nothing can ever compete with the high and holy demands of our spiritual nature; and the more we learn of what is going on around us the more intense will be our desire to read the profounder secrets that are working within; the more we know of the past, the more anxious we must be to penetrate the solemn realities of the future. The preacher's work is not yet done, and he has the comfort of knowing that he deals with men and women who are every day becoming better and better informed respecting the subjects of which he treats—more critical, perhaps, than their progenitors; more sceptical, it may be; more agnostic in their tendencies; but this ought to rouse him to higher effort and make him more careful in the statement of his principles and more scrupulous in the treatment of his facts and arguments. The controversies which distract all our churches to-day, however deplorable they may be in certain aspects, are still signs of life; and it is better for the preacher to deal with those who are disturbed in spirit than with people who passively accept everything that is told them without any action of their own minds. It is better to address the living than the dead. All the discouraging things to which I have referred are more than counterbalanced by the fact that the well-instructed, well-balanced minister of Christ stands upon a firmer foundation than any of his predecessors ever did. The theological discussions of the day are gradually disclosing the weaker points in our lines of defence; while, at the same time, they make manifest the eternal truth, which cannot be confounded. The popular apprehension of God is clearer than it ever was before; and all our ethics and theology are only the unfolding of the root idea of God. It is folly to say that the interest in sermons has gone by. Let a man rise up who has a word to say that comes home to the hearts of men, and there will be no lack of an audience. Witness the fact, how, a year or two ago, the clamors of Wall Street were hushed at noontide day after day, while the tide of speculators and busy men surged into the great church in Broadway to hear a real man speak real things to their souls.

Neither can it be said that there has been a falling off, during the present generation, in the standard of learning and ability among our preachers. It would be strange if it were so, when we consider the great advance that has been made in the style of theological training in all denominations. As a general rule, the professors in our divinity schools are selected from the ranks of those who are most learned in their profession and most apt to teach. They are supposed to represent the living thought of the age, to have a breadth of vision beyond that of ordinary men, to be capable not only of profound thinking themselves, but to have the gift of making others think; and, therefore, we have a right to expect that the men who come forth from their hands will be competent to discharge their duties with vigor and effectiveness. And yet, for some reason, the number of preachers who are sought after on the ground of their power in the pulpit is comparatively small. Men of abundant learning, clear-headed men, who can talk well and write well in other departments, fail to interest their congregations, and very likely after a time relapse into obscurity. The instances of such failures are innumerable and sad to think upon. Why is it so? Various answers may be given to this question.

The sermons which are preached are not unfrequently altogether unfitted to meet the wants of the congregation. A clergyman who was called to address an assembly of the roughest kind of people in Texas, many of whom had never seen the inside of a church, and possibly had never heard a Gospel sermon, preached to them at some length on the evils incident to the pew system. A learned Western divine recently remarked that he had delivered a course of seventeen sermons on the *Filioque*, and regretted to say that they did not appear to have done any good. A rector on the Hudson River, who had worn out the patience of his flock with doctrinal dissertations in which they had no interest, was requested to give them a course of practical sermons; which he agreed to do, beginning with a discourse on the symbolism of the *Ichthus*. I once heard a sermon on "The Crown of Life," which consisted of an elaborate disquisition on the various styles of head-dress which had been adopted by man and womankind; the moral of the discourse being to the effect that the structure worn on the head was more significant than any other article of apparel—the king being known by his crown, the bishop by his mitre, and so on. In a remote country region, where there is not so much as a post-office, or even a shop of any description, a good brother from the city preached on the expediency of opening the public libraries and museums of art on Sunday.

Men of better judgment often fail to secure the attention of their hearers by habitual dwelling upon topics which have no hold upon the people and no relevancy to any real wants of the soul; discussion of dry old dogmas, which the world has long ago ceased to care about; digging up and exposing to view dead heresies, in order to show how horrible they were when they were alive; carefully elaborated treatises of trivial matters of costume and postures and ecclesiological symbols; minute textual criticisms, with some reference, perhaps, to the bearings of the Greek particle ; long-winded sketches of Old Testament characters and historical events, which are perfectly familiar to Bible readers, and of very little interest to other people ; speculations and theories and interpretations of the apocalyptic symbols, about which no two scholars agree ; hunting up typical meanings in Hebrew names ; finding the name of God in the Book of Esther, concealed in an ingenious acrostic—such preaching as this must of necessity diffuse a narcotic influence, and make it difficult for the most reverent worshipper to listen with much attention. But let the preacher put all this folly aside and stand up face to face with his people, and make them see that he understands them and knows what are their greatest perils and most urgent spiritual needs, and is in true sympathy with them, and in some degree competent to help them—then there will be no somnolent Christians nodding in their pews, and very few careless old sinners watching the flies as they flit about in the air.

An excellent and highly polished clergyman, in taking charge of a very fashionable church in New York, is said to have defined his position in his introductory sermon by this well-guarded and carefully balanced statement : " You may rest assured, beloved brethren, that so long as I am allowed to stand in this holy place, virtue must be respected and vice discountenanced." This was safe ground to stand upon. Last summer I preached to a Newport congregation on the dangers to which rich and fashionable people are exposed, and the wretchedness and worthlessness of an aimless life ; and I afterward heard that it was said by more than one person that I had shown a lamentable want of tact in preaching on such a subject to such an audience.

The dulness of many preachers is, in a measure, attributable to the fact that their sermons are all constructed upon substantially the same model. Some years ago *Simeon's Skeletons* rattled on the shelves of almost every clerical library, and many a sermon was framed by an attempt to clothe the dry bones with life—to very little purpose. Happily for the world, they are now for the most part buried, as all skeletons should be, unless they are kept for anatomical studies. Something like sixty years ago one of our good professors in the theological seminary that I attended gave me at some length the process by which he constructed a sermon. " After I have selected my text," he said, " I take my paper, and leaving space enough for the introduction, I insert my first leading head. Allowing a sufficient number of pages for that, I next write out the second leading head, and then in the same way the third, and so on, according to the number of general divisions which I propose to introduce. Then, at proper intervals, I insert the minor divisions of the discourse ; and having done this, I proceed to fill up some one of the intervening spaces ; after which I usually lean back my head and take a sweet nap." As might be expected, the napping was not confined to the *writer* of the sermon.

Many years ago I sat for a while under the ministry of an eminent divine ; and whatever the text might be, five times out of six, the first of his three heads—and this was the invariable number—dealt with " man's fallen state by nature ;" the second with the great doctrine of " justification by faith alone ;" and the third and last head varied somewhat in accordance with the text. The style of the sermon was what some people call " good classical English." Man was always spoken of as " a denizen of earth." Asia was " a foreign strand ;" the broad road was transmuted into " this vast arena, frequented by far the largest numerical majority ;" while the preacher's favorite illustration was the somewhat familiar statement that " the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain."

A sermon is almost certain to be dreary and dull when we do not see the *man* behind it, and there is nothing to make us feel that it is a living being who is addressing the congregation. Lay reading is not popular, even when the discourses read are of the highest order, because we are conscious that the man is not saying anything that comes out of any process of his own mind. A sermon that can be preached just as well by one person as another must be rather a poor sort of thing. In order to the enkindling of real emotion, it is necessary that direct communication should be established between the speaker and the hearer—the flint and steel must come in contact before there can be a spark.

We cannot always tell why we are so unmoved under the preaching of one man, while another, who, perhaps, has nothing like his gifts of eloquence, and not one half as much profound thought, makes the blood tingle and stirs the soul to its depths. We say that one has a peculiar magnetic power of which the other is destitute, whatever this may mean. All that we know about it is that the charming periods of the former fall upon our ear

> "Like snow upon a river—
> A moment white, then gone forever;"

while the simpler words of the latter cling to us all through the day, and all through the night, and clarify the soul and fill it with sweetness and light.

There are preachers who impress us with the feeling that they are telling what they have been taught to say, and what they are expected to say, and what it is proper for them to say; but somehow it leaves no impression; we assent to it, and perhaps admire it, and that is the end of it—it is all very good and very dull.

A certain degree of dulness is to be expected when the preacher feels himself for any reason restrained from the utterance of his real opinions. In such a case, the man is apt to fall out of sight, and an automaton takes his place. The men who move the world always speak from that which is in them, and not from that which comes to them.

It hardly needs to be said that in order to move the age, they must be somewhat in advance of it, and not move with it. One who would interest and influence men must be true to himself, and let the figure of the man be outlined in his words. The preacher who never says a doubtful thing is very likely never to say a true thing—anything which is a genuine reflection of his own soul.

Two preachers may use the same material of doctrine, and from the mouth of one it comes incandescent with light and heat, and from the lips of another it falls like icicles on a frozen ground.

There are men who lift us off our feet not so much by what they say as by their way of saying it; and we surrender ourselves to their power, and the soul vibrates to their touch as the harp to the fingers of the player; and one by one the inner gates of the heart are unlocked, and we begin to see ourselves as we are—all the dark recesses of the soul are laid bare; all the nobler elements of our nature which had been lying dormant are called into action; all the Christlike sympathies, which only needed the touch of Christ's real minister to quicken into life, are aroused, and there is no further effort needed to keep the mind from wandering off into space—we must listen, we cannot help listening.

A sermon that is made to order, and prepared without any reference to the condition of those who are expected to listen to it, must be dull; and the devices to which some men resort in order to relieve the dulness only tend to aggravate it. There is an artificial earnestness not unfrequently displayed in the pulpit—a thundering and a thrashing altogether out of proportion to the sentiment of the discourse. There is nothing more tedious than the monotony of vociferation; and why there should be so much bellowing in the pulpit it is not easy to tell. I once asked a well-known preacher, after he came down from the pulpit on a warm day, thoroughly exhausted by the physical effort he had been making, what necessity there was for such an amount of gesticulation and noise, and he modestly replied, "I do it in order to conceal the absence of thought;" which, however, he did not quite succeed in doing.

The effectiveness of preaching is often impaired by excessive and unqualified statements, drawing large inferences from very small premises, twisting texts of Scripture in all directions in support of a favorite doctrine, always drawing a sharp line between saints and sinners, as if, at the call of the roll, all the sheep might at once be placed on one side of the aisle and all the goats on the other, leading, perhaps, to unfortunate conclusions on both sides; appealing exclusively to the pains and penalties of the world to come, and neglecting to dwell upon that class of motives which bear upon the formation of character and the destiny of men in the present life; indulging in the same uniform style of exhortation Sunday after Sunday, until it ceases to make any impression; all these things tend to blunt the edge of our preaching.

One secret of the proverbial dulness of sermons is attributable to the fact of their assuming so generally the form of an essay or an oration instead of a direct plea, like that which a lawyer addresses to the jury. There are men who preach *about* the Gospel with considerable skill, but they never really preach the Gospel; they rarely, if ever, make any direct appeal to the people; the sentences are well formed, and express the thought with great propriety, but there is an entire absence of the colloquial element; no talking with the people face to face, no earnest pleading of one soul with another. The preacher stands up in the pulpit to deliver a speech which he has prepared with much care; it is as sound and orthodox as a sermon could possibly be; it shows large and rare reading; it is full of valuable thought; it has some very striking rhetorical embellishments; it is a sermon "fit to preach before a king"—perhaps not before the King of kings; but although it is admired, and makes the congregation proud of their minister and wonder that he is not called to a city parish, no one goes home feeling that any load has been taken from his soul, or any doubt relieved, or any practical counsel given that he can carry with him into the details of his busy life; no one goes home with a sting in his heart of which he can never be relieved until he finds pardon and peace at the foot of the cross.

This want of simple directness is one of the greatest faults in our preaching, and one of the main causes of its dulness. Declamation is the curse of the pulpit; and by this I mean that sort of speech which reminds us of school-boys "speaking their piece." If a preacher knew that he was delivering his last sermon, I am inclined to think that it would not be spoken of as "a beautiful discourse" or "an eloquent and learned address."

There is nothing so much needed in our theological seminaries as the teaching young men how to preach—if, indeed, that is a thing which can be *taught*. Some men are born preachers, and others are not; and it is doubtful whether there is any process by which they could be made preachers any more than you can make a poet. Still there are many things which our candidates for the ministry might be taught—such lessons, for instance, as are contained in Bishop Brook's well-known "Lectures on Preaching," and which have helped so many.

It may seem as if we were coming down to a lower level when we speak of the voice as a most important element in preaching; but there can be no question that the dulness of the pulpit is very often attributable to some defect of utterance. There are certain preachers who seem to make no special effort to be heard at all—indistinct in their enunciation, chewing up the consonants in every complicated word, most inaudible when they intend to be most impressive; at first you make an effort to listen, because there seems to be something worth hearing behind all this mumble of words, but you soon give it up, and the discourse upon which the speaker has expended his best efforts in the composition never reaches the hearts of the congregation, because it never found entrance into their ears. Another man is distinct enough, but it is a dreary monotony of sound—no variation from the beginning to the end; "a drowsy tinkling," which always ends in "lulling the fold" to slumber. On the other hand, there are preachers who begin with a shout and end with a shout—the howling of the wind never abates; it rises higher and higher until the bellows gives out, and then the noise is over.

There are some persons whose natural tone of voice is such as should exclude them from the pulpit altogether—cold, hard, rasping, rough, incapable of tenderness or real earnestness, grating all the while like a rusty saw that is constantly striking a nail in the log; people who have such voices as this should address the public through the eye and not through the ear.

Every utterance of the soul has its appropriate tone, and cannot be fully expressed except through the medium of that tone. In every-day conversation we strike the true note unconsciously; every emotion creates its true utterance; the tones of anger, rebuke, contempt are never misunderstood; the Billingsgate fishwoman always scolds in the right key. The tones of love and tenderness are just as unmistakable. By a change in the inflection the meaning of a sentence may be reversed. If I am asked whether a certain man really believes what he is saying, and I reply, "He believes it as much as he believes in the existence of a God," the significance of the answer is determined altogether by the use of the downward or the circumflex accent.

No sermon can be true unless it is delivered in the true tone; neither can it be edifying or interesting. The dulness of the pulpit is owing, in a great degree, to the want of tone, in more senses than one. Unless there is some perversity in the man's nature, it might be presumed that earnestness would of necessity induce the true tone; and yet how rarely do we hear from the pulpit just the quality of voice which the sentiment demands. Would that what is known as "the holy tone" might be forever banished from our churches, and all our preachers would speak and read as nature teaches them to speak, and as they certainly would if they could forget all about themselves in the message they are called to deliver.

To say of a sermon that "it was not very dull" is not the highest praise; a discourse may be lively to a fault, and at the same time utterly unprofitable. I once heard a sermon that reminded me of the simultaneous discharge of all the various materials collected for an elaborate pyrotechnical display; from the beginning to the end the air seemed to be blazing with Roman candles, and fiery serpents, and sparkling wheels, and coruscating rockets, and when the show was over,

> "Blinded by excess of light,"

everything seemed darker than it was before.

There was more or less of this high-flown sermonizing in Dr. South's day, as would appear from what he says in commenting on the words of St. Paul, "I preach not with the enticing words of man's wisdom." "Nothing here," says Dr. South, "of 'the fringe of the north star;' nothing of 'nature's becoming unnatural;' nothing of 'the down of angels' wings;' or 'the beautiful locks of cherubim;' no starched similitudes introduced with a 'Thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion,' and the like. No; these were similitudes above the rise of apostolic spirit; for the apostles, poor mortals, were content to take lower steps, and to tell the world in plain terms that he who believeth shall be saved, and that he who believeth not shall be damned."

If all our preachers would take into serious account the actual condition of the people whom they address, what a revolution there would be in the pulpit! What power there may be in a simple word of warning, or counsel, or comfort, or instruction!

Right before the preacher a man may be seated who is on the verge of some great crime; the tempest is at this moment raging in his soul; conscience remonstrates, but her voice is every moment becoming weaker; the risk is terrible, but then the prize is so dazzling; the man is almost ready to yield, his feet are on the brink, when the low, pleading voice falls upon his ear, "Wilt thou do this great thing, my son, and sin against thy God?" and he is saved.

Not far off another hearer may be seated who, as it seems to him, has already sinned beyond redemption; he has not yet gone to hell, but hell has come to him, and the grip of despair is on his soul. The secret of his sin is buried out of sight, and no one knows of it but God; this only makes it all the harder to bear. *Hope* is dead; is there no message for this miserable man? In the midst of the darkness and the storm the blessed words steal into his soul "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. Come unto me and I will give you rest." Gradually the darkness is dissipated, and he finds peace in believing.

In yonder pew there may be seen another who is racked with doubt; the foundation of his faith is giving way—a cloud is gathering that makes everything obscure and ghostly; he feels that when his trust in the Gospel is gone, all that made life worth living for has gone; but he is distracted by doubts and difficulties that stagger him; can the preacher do anything to help this poor man! Not unless he knows how to give him *real* help; not unless he knows how to present the truth in such a way as to lift it out of the reach of microscopic criticism, so that it shall shine, as the sun does, by its own light.

In a remote corner of the church one may be seen upon whom the hand of sorrow has fallen—the light has gone out in her dwelling, and she is alone. There is nothing left on earth to comfort her; the commonplaces of sympathy give her no relief; she wants something that has Christ's impress upon it; she longs to touch the hem of His garment, and bathe His feet with her tears, and hear Him speak to her. Has the minister of Christ no true word for her?

There may be still another hearer—an aged father in Israel who has long been familiar with the ways of godliness. He comes to church because he loves to be there; he comes to worship, and might be content if no sermon were preached; but, if it is to be preached, he wants to hear something that will lift him up and help him forward. He wants to hear something about Christ, and His work and His dealings with His people; he wants to be built up and edified, and have his own way made more clear. Now that the end is approaching he wants to be brought nearer to his Saviour, and have some fresh assurance of the glories that are to come. Is it not hard when such a good old believer as this is fed with nothing but dust and chaff?

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

PERSONAL CHRISTIANITY.*

BY REV. LLEWELYN I. EVANS, D.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CINCINNATI, O.

Most concisely, although not, perhaps, in all respects most satisfactorily, I may state the theme of the present discussion to be *Personal Christianity.* The phrase may call for a word or two of justification. Can Christianity be anything but personal? An impersonal Christianity—would not that be a logical self-contradiction? True; but unfortunately our practical thinking is already full of self-contradictions, and the only way oftentimes to meet these successfully is to insist on the truisms or the tautologies which they obscure or deny. When Christianity becomes a dead shell, we need to remind ourselves that there is such a thing as vital Christianity. When it is sublimated into dreamlike idealities, we are required to emphasize historic Christianity. When it degenerates into a mechanical formalism, it is time to reproclaim a spiritual Christianity. When undue prominence is given to its abstract, impersonal factors, we shall do well to reaffirm with all earnestness the predication of a personal Christianity.

---

* Opening Address, delivered at Lane Theological Seminary, September 10, 1891.

Personality—the highest and the greatest of all the general predications of existence; Christianity—the highest and the greatest of all the special predications of existence; personality—the highest type of reality; Christianity—the highest type of quality; personality—the divinest entity; Christianity—the divinest expression:—the vital affinity between these two predestinates their fusion. Personality is alike the primary and the ultimate fact of Christianity; Christianity assures to personality its purest and largest significance. Their synthesis is the transcendent reality of being and of life.

Let me ask you to reflect a moment how much it means that the profoundest and most fruitful movements of religious thought and life have their root in the more vital apprehension of the fact and implications of personality. The Protestant Reformation was nothing less than the uprising of personality as a spiritual force in the effort to throw off the dead weight of mediæval mechanicalism. Mark the vitality and the power of individualism both in the formal and the material principles of the Reformation. Take the formal principle of the Reformation—the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture—wherein does its sugnificance lie? Just in this; it would push aside every interruptive mechanism in the transmission of the Divine Word to the hungering soul of man. Rejecting the artificial jets of ecclesiastical gas works, it would drink its light straight from the eternal stars. Or take the material principle of Protestantism, justification by faith; wherein does its significance lie? Just in this: it would sweep away every contrivance which, in the great crisis of the spiritual life, would intervene between the Divine personality and the human personality, and bring the soul by faith into direct contact with a living, infinite Saviour.

Puritanism in like manner is the protest of pure personality, quickened and spiritualized, against the more impure and impersonal accretions of a materialized sensuous religion. Its affirmation of simplicity has for its motive the desire to rid the renewed spirit of all that would encumber and hamper its free outgoing toward God, and its full internal reception of God.

In Methodism, again, alike of Wesley and of Whitefield, we see the insurgence of the Christian personality against enervating conventionalisms, deadening rubrics of an exhausted formalism, the benumbing blight of a secularized church. Methodism is thus the voice of the Christian consciousness repudiating its dependence on external, decaying appliances, asserting itself against the repressions of empty routine and hearsay, and seeking to put itself once more in communication with the primary, personal sources of the deepest, most sacred and abiding experiences of the soul.

Or look again at the spiritualism to which Schleiermacher, Neander, and Coleridge have given an impulse: what does it mean? In its inmost essence it means the rejection of the unrealities, the abstractions and assumptions of a religious empiricism, or of a traditional mechanicalism, or of an *à priori* dogmatism, which has lost its grasp on the immediacy and certitude of the personal communion between the living God and His children.

In a word, every spiritual awakening or advance in religious development approves itself as a movement from a Religion of Things, of forms, institutions, external and more or less material mediations; from a religion of words, abstractions, dogmas, traditions, second-hand appurtenances, to a Religion of Personality—a religion which accords their full value to the factors of the largest personal life, which quickens into the most intense activity the central, dominant forces of consciousness—a religion of living, personal powers without, and of vivid personal qualities within, correlated to each other at first hand, and acting on each other under the laws of a direct, sublime, divine reciprocity. From a Religion of Things to a Religion of Personality—there you have the essential note of all spiritual progress.

Indeed, when you come to think of it, all progress defines itself as the advance of personality, the triumph of free spirit over the impersonal environment. Material progress —is it not just that: *personality* handling, moulding *the things* which surround it, asserting its mastery over them, impressing itself on nature, transfusing and assimilating all material conditions, elements and forces to its own uses and life? Scientific progress—is it not just that: finding the key of *personal thought and purpose* which unlocks the mysteries of the universe? Science is on the hunt for Law; and what is Law but the expression of the uniformity of Personal Thinking and Willing underlying all phenomena of change and movement? Nature is thus the transcript of personal processes, the movements of the Eternal Mind. Leave out the Thinker, of what worth the Thought? Nay, is not its reality as thought, as well as its value, due to the Mind back of it? The discovery of truth is, in a word, finding out the ways and workings of the Supreme Reason. Herein lies the fascination of every such discovery; it introduces a thinking mind to the Infinite Thinker. Its joy is the joy of thinking, with Kepler, God's thoughts after him. Truth has thus both its source and destination in personality.

Beauty, too, which eludes every definition, but the attraction of which attests none the less its supremacy, depends for its power and charm on its spiritual source and quality. Its correspondences, harmonies, graces, its subtle, melting winsomeness, its entrancing, purifying virtue have their norm in the Divine Soul, with whom the fairest dreams, the purest loves, the sweetest raptures have their eternal home.

Leave out the personal factor, and you have but a crude congeries of things, *rudis indigestaque moles*, of no significance or worth. But bring all into its proper correspondence to personality; put matter in its place, mind in its place, God in His place, man in his place, and chaos becomes cosmos, and the discord of atoms resolves itself into the music of the spheres.

> "The sequences of law
> We learn through mind alone,
> 'Tis only through the soul
> That aught we know is known:
> With equal voice she tells
> Of what we touch and see
> Within these bounds of life,
> And of a life to be:
> Proclaiming One who brought us hither,
> And holds the keys of *Whence* and *Whither*."

Until Mind appears, Matter has no story to tell. But

> "Man once descried imprints forever
> His presence on all lifeless things; the winds
> Are henceforth voices, . . .
> Never a senseless gust now man is born!
> The herded pines commune and have deep thoughts.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The morn has enterprise, deep quiet droops
> With evening, triumph takes the sunset hour,
> And this to fill us with regard for man,
> Desire to work his proper nature out.
> . . . All tended to mankind,
> And, man produced, all has its end thus far:
> But in completed man begins anew
> The tendency to God."

This "progress is the law of life," through matter to mind, through mind to God—all from, through, to God:

> "Himself the way that leads us thither,
> The All-in-All, the Whence and Whither."

If, then, all progress defines itself as the advance and triumph of personality, much more will this be true of Christianity, by which alone progress along the most spiritual and divine lines is possible for man.

I would have you now trace with me the line of this divine movement—so far, at least, as to glance at a few of the outstanding headlands which mark its majestic course. And let me ask you at the outset not to prejudge the discussion as either unpractical or superfluous. I am greatly mistaken if it shall not appear that a more distinct and vital apprehension of Christianity as a Religion of Personality in contrast with a Religion of Things is the one thing needed just now to correct and enlarge our conceptions of its contents, and to recover for our Christian thinking, living, and experience much of the power which has been lost.

If we are asked: "What is the pre-eminent claim which Christianity makes in its own behalf?" our answer would be: "It claims, first of all, and chiefest of all, to possess and to disclose the secret of salvation." If asked: "Wherein lies the need of salvation?" our answer to this again would be: "In sin." And what is sin? The secret of salvation involves the secret of sin; and the secret of sin lies in personality. Personality is the power of being other than a thing, the power of free choice, free activity, free development. What we call a *Thing* has no such power. Its history is a part of the series of causalities, of necessary changes and effects, that we call Nature. Its course is absolutely and irresistibly determined by conditions outside of itself. It cannot be other than it is; it cannot do other than it does. In such a history there can be no sin. But neither in such a history can there be freedom; and in the absence of freedom the higher developments of life, of growth, of blessedness are forever impossible.

Professor Huxley has said: "I protest that if some great Power would agree to make me always think what is true, and do what is right on condition of being turned into a sort of clock and wound up every morning before I got out of bed, I should instantly close with the offer. The only freedom I care about is the freedom to do right; the freedom to do wrong I am ready to part with on the cheapest terms to any one one who will take it of me" (Lay Sermons: On Descartes' Discourse). This striking declaration, much as we may admire its moral earnestness, furnishes the elements of its own refutation. If Mr. Huxley could be turned into a clock, the question of thinking what is true and doing what is right would cease to be a question for him at all. For a machine there is, there can be no such term as right or truth. To the clock it is a matter of absolute indifference whether it goes right or wrong. Mr. Huxley, if made up of clock wheels and clock springs, and wound up every morning, would have had no such desire to do right as he so vividly expresses. He would not even have wanted to be a clock, or to be anything else, for the sake of going right. A machine never does right; it never wants to. A thing never goes wrong; it does not care about it. In a world of things, of machines, of necessary causations, right or wrongdoing would be a matter of no concern; there would be no recognition of sin, there could be no recognition of holiness. Freedom to do right means freedom to do wrong. The power to be godlike implies the power to defy God, to usurp the throne of God, to put self in the place of God. That is sin; and the power to commit sin is one of the inalienable, awful attributes of personality. And the further terrible penalty of that sin is the loss of the conscious dignity of personality, *the willingness to become a thing,* to abdicate the freedom of a child of God, to submit to the iron causality of influences urging to evil, and thus to be immured in the bondage of corruption. "He that commits sin is the bondman of sin."

This, too, is the curse of scientific materialism, that, having begun with the evacuation of personality, it ends with the elimination of sin. What theologians call sin it declares to be but one of the myriad mischances of existence, brought about by the evolutionary sequences of nature. The Fall of Man is simply a necessary incident of progress, a stumbling upward. Having thus no place for sin, materialism has no place for Christianity; and this belittling of sin and of Christianity, mark you, goes hand in hand with the belittling of personality. For let us not lose sight of the great retributive fact—to which reference has already been made—that sin, being in its root and essence the abdication of the regal rights and functions of personality, means the permanent degradation of manhood, the launching of a personal agent on the career of a thing, imposing the law of necessity in place of the law of liberty; bringing the higher nature into bondage to the lower; clipping the wings of the angel and bidding him to crawl in the trail of the worm.

This, alas! is the moral condition that confronts us in a fallen world; a condition how hopeless in and of itself! How can a thing—a thing, too, by choice—become a person? how can a self-enthralled slave be made free? how can the earthly put on the Heavenly One? Here is the problem to which Christianity addresses itself. What is the first condition of the solution of this problem? Manifestly it is the restoration of personality to its rights and functions, the resumption by the angel of the wings wherewith it may soar above the attractions and gravitations of the natural life, and rise to the loftiness, largeness, liberty, energy, beauty, and fulness of a life in the immediate presence of God, and in living touch with Him.

And how is this result to be effected? Manifestly by the intervention of a Power from beyond the World of Things, by the influx of the Supernatural into the realm of the natural. For Nature cannot emancipate from nature. The life of a Thing, or a life which has degenerated into the life of a Thing, cannot lift itself up to the full height and measure of a free, Godlike personality. The Divine Personality must stoop down, touch the lower, degenerated life, communicate itself to that life, impart to it its own life. Christianity is thus—objectively, the communication to man of the Divine Personal Life; subjectively, the reception by man of that Divine Personal Life; concretely, the re-establishment in man of his lost personal life and divineness. As Christ says, it is the prodigal "coming to himself," the outcast coming to the realization of the Divine sonship, and of "the freedom wherewith the Son makes free." In the religious dialect of Peter, it is becoming "partakers of the Divine Nature." In the vivid sententiousness of James, it is "the perfect law, the law of liberty," "the royal law" of love; "royal" as being not only the king among laws, but the law of kings, enfranchising those who obey it into the rank and rights of kingship. In the lofty mysticism of John, it is the indwelling of the Divine Life in such fulness and power that absolute freedom becomes inability to sin. "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him ; and he cannot sin because he is begotten of God ;" and there you have Christianity's answer to Mr. Huxley's yearning after a freedom to do right which will never go wrong. In the dramatic, psychological realism of Paul, it is the Saul-ego dying into the Paul-ego, and the Paul-ego transformed into the Christ-ego. "I no longer live, but Christ liveth in me ; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, that faith which is in the Son of God." "For me to live is Christ."

Christianity thus presupposes as its fundamental postulate that man's true life consists in communion with God. God is the spiritual complement of a perfect manhood, the element, the atmosphere, the home of the soul.

> "God only is the creature's home,
> Though rough and strait the road ;
> Yet nothing less can satisfy
> The love that longs for God."

Man's redemption is accordingly the re-establishment of this Divine Communion, God making His home in man, man finding his home in God. "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him." There is an awakening of manhood in the awakening of the God-consciousness within. To see God, to know God, to realize God, this is the first condition of seeing, knowing, realizing my true being.

Now this—let me emphasize the thought—is an intensely personal process. First, you see, it presupposes the personal activity of God in making Himself known, in realizing Himself to me.

> "'Tis rather God who seeks for us,
> Than we who seek for Him.
> God was not gone, but He so longed
> His sweetness to impart,
> He, too, was seeking for a bane,
> And found it in my heart."

The revelation of God to the soul—what is it ? A thing, a definition, a dogma, a book, an impersonal medium ? Impossible ! In any revelation of God, the chief factor, the central, the real factor, the factor without which every circumstantiality were an empty, meaningless form, is God Himself. Given God, all else matters but little ; given God, and all the rest will follow. Let God be there, and the acacia bush in the wilderness will burn with the splendors of the Shekinah. Let God be in it, and the prattling of the babe will say more than the logic of the archangel. The revelation thus derives its orginal and special significance from the supreme personality of its Divine Agent.

But this is not all. The process is one of living personal reciprocity. By the divine correlation of energy the personal activity of God passes over into personal activity on the part of man. "If that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended." Before the revelation can be in any sense real and complete, the personal recipiency must respond to the personal communication. The more of personality there is in the receiving, the larger will be the revelation. This, you see, must be so. There can be no revelation of personality to a thing. There can be no spiritual revelation to an unspiritual intelligence, for spiritualities are spiritually discerned. The thoughts which wander through eternity, the sensibilities which find relief in tears, nay, which do often lie too deep for tears, the spiritual intuitions of divine realities and necessities,

> "Which are the fountain-light of all our day,
> The master-light of all our seeing,"

the moral convictions, which, like the bird of Jove, grasp the thunderbolts of everlasting law, the deathless yearning after immortality, the delight in truth and right for their own sake, the power of self-sacrifice for love's sweet sake, the enthusiasm of humanity, the inspiration of divinity—all this finds no response below the level of personality, and, indeed, of spiritual personality. The revelation of the supreme, all-perfect personality that we call God can be conveyed only to the reason, the conscience, the will, to the instinct of beauty, the power of love, the sense of the infinite, the presentiment of eternity. It becomes a revelation through the appeal which it makes to these divine constituents of our being, and the response which it evokes therefrom. God revealing Himself to me—what is that ? It is God correlating Himself to this part and to that part of my being, moving on this faculty, capturing that sentiment, energizing such a motive. asserting Himself in such a purpose, illuminating a thought here, sweetening an experience there. But mark it ! these activities are each and all my own. My personality expresses itself in them. I am in them ; God too is in them : through them I learn to interpret, to realize, to know God. Apart from them God were a blank ; apart from God they were but shadows, mere possibilities. Their activity is made real by His. It is His coming into my life which makes it life. It is He that puts to flight the nightmare of the evil past ; it is His touch that quickens. that starts the vital currents, that stirs the impulses of devotion and service. So does Paul teach, "That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God manifested it unto them." That is to say, the external and the internal revelation condition each the other. Or, as Jacobi puts it, the consonant of the one finds its vowel in the other; and thus the Word, the revelation of God, is made complete. The Unknown God, whom before I ignorantly worshipped, if at all, becomes known to me. He is become a reality; I have found Him. "If, happily, they might feel after Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us." "Too late!" so does Augustine pour out his soul in one of his wonderful apostrophes: "Too late I loved Thee, O Thou Beauty of ancient days, yet ever new! Too late I loved Thee! And behold, Thou wert within and I abroad, and there I searched for Thee; deformed I, plunging amid those fair forms which Thou hadst made. Thou wert with me, but I was not with Thee. Things held me far from Thee, which, unless they were in Thee, were not at all. Thou didst call and shout and burst my deafness. Thou didst breathe odors, and I drew in breath and panted for Thee. I tasted—and hunger and thirst. Thou touchedst me, and I burned for Thy peace" (Confessions, Book X.). Even so; God touching me until my being is on fire with Himself; God thinking Himself into my thoughts; God loving Himself into my love; God living Himself into my life—that is revelation, that is religion, that is Christianity, that is life! "With Thee is the fountain of life; in Thy light shall we see light." What I see as a luminous, indubitable reality, I see in God's light. In that outstreaming of God, that Divine halo, I exercise intuition, reflection, faith, worship. God's shining is all around me and through me; in that shining I behold and believe. God's warmth is all about me and within me; in that warmth I feel. God's love floods my being; in that love I love.

Our personal activities are thus respondent to the personal activities of God. "We love because He first loved us." The consciousness of God heightens, deepens, widens the sense of our personal consciousness; and in this enlargement and exaltation of the latter God becomes credible, knowable, real. The dignity of personality in man, the reality of personality in God—each conditions the other. In every revelation God must be interpreted through the soul. The objective self-manifestation of God necessarily comes first; but this can become a completed revelation only through the subjective interpretation and appropriation. God becomes a part of me only through my partaking of Him.

Monergism and Synergism are equally true, and each is necessary to the other. Without monergism—*i.e.*, without the primal Divine Energy, there can be no synergism—*i.e.*, there can be no answering cooperant energy of the human coeffiicent. Without synergism—*i.e.*, without the cooperating human coefficient, monergism would fail of its consummation; for even the Divine Energy is graduated by that in which it works. The Divine Energy in the worm cannot furnish the measure of the Divine Energy in Augustine, or Luther, or Wesley. The more the man, the more the God within him; the more the God within, the more the man. Our Lord's paradox, "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," is an incontrovertible truth, but it is the truth of hyperbole. As a matter of fact, God never does raise a spiritual aristocracy out of dead stones. But, as the Apostle Paul shows, the seed of Abraham embraces those, and only those who are of the faith of Abraham (Gal. iii. 7); and the faith of Abraham, as the same Apostle shows (Rom. iv. 19–21), is the highest exponent of spiritual energy which the world has ever seen; the noblest activity of which a finite personality is capable. Through that activity, as the Apostle James also shows (ii. 23), Abraham reached the loftiest personal dignity to which man can aspire. "Abraham believed God . . . and he was called the friend of God."

A parallel truth we find in the inspired teaching that we attain to the Vision of God through personal self-purification. "Follow after the sanctification, without which no man shall see the Lord." "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." And how much is implied in that wonderful declaration of our Lord's, "This is life eternal that they should know Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ"! Mark the expression! The highest possible knowledge of God, the knowledge of God in the uniqueness and the reality of His being, is life; not a single activity of life—not intellectual life merely, not moral life alone, but life itself in its generic fulness and absoluteness; eternal life, the climax, the maximum of life, life at its highest, longest, largest, best. But mark, farther, the complete statement! "This is life eternal, to know God and Him whom God sent, even Jesus Christ," to know God, that is, in the ultimate expression of Himself, in the definite, historic, personal embodiment of His perfections and purposes in Jesus Christ.

And here we strike upon the very core of Christianity as the Religion of the Incarnation. As was said already, Christianity is characteristically not a Religion of Things, not a religion of abstractions or dogmas, but of Personal Realities. It is so pre-eminently in its revelation of God. In Christianity we have, if I may say so, the ultimatum of the Divine Personality. The Religion of Nature gives us indeed a personal God; but this truth is beset with constant peril from the liabilities of our sinful humanity, from a debased anthropomorphism, a vague pantheism, a coarse materialism, a shallow pyrrhonism. Even in Judaism the Divine Personality is lost in a Divine Legality. The Law itself, by which God speaks, comes between the people and God. At the reading of Moses a veil lieth upon the heart. Everywhere, in Gentilism and in Judaism, there is still something lacking to keep the world in touch with God. The Most High must come lower yet, nearer yet to man. There must be a face-to-face beholding of the Divine Glory, heart-to-heart contact with the Divine Life. This is what the Gospel assures us took place in the Incarnation. In Christ the veil is taken away. He is the last and the greatest of the Theophanies. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "The Word was God . . . and the Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us." In the Incarnate Logos the Divine Personality becomes a historic, visible, audible, tangible reality. "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld and our hands handled, concerning the Word of Life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us), that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

Christ is the practical answer to the difficulties and contradictions of our earthly metaphysics in its speculations about the Divine Personality. In Christ we find the actual reconciliation of the Infinite with the limitations of a personal consciousness. In Christ as a historic personality, the belief in a personal God ceases to be an insoluble logical paradox, and becomes a rapturous, inspiring reality. At His feet our Doubt falls down in lowly, holy adoration, crying out, "My Lord and my God!" Christ—who will not admit it?—Christ is the living personal embodiment of the Highest Being, of the Most Perfect Life. In Him the Fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily, and in Him we are made full. Out of Him remains the infinite void, the eternal unrest. "My heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." "Oh, that I knew where I might find Him!" So rings out the wail of the ages, the sad refrain of humanity.

Where is God?—for a God man must have. "If there were no God it would be necessary to invent Him." Even so, Voltaire. Thought must have a God—an Infinite in relation to whom there is no Beyond. Worship must have a God—a Highest than whom there can be no Higher. Conscience must have a God—a Supreme Will, whose absolute masterhood is law, whose Yea is life, whose Nay is death. Love must have a God—consummate Perfection, forever satisfying the enlarging capacities, the crescent hopes, the ever-mounting aspirations, the ever-widening and deepening activities of the ever-growing life eternal. Oh God! God! God! Where shall we look for Thee? Where shall we find Thee? Our thoughts scale the firmaments; where art Thou? Our prayers climb the heavens; where art Thou? Our dreams soar over the infinities and sweep through the eternities; where art Thou? Our speculations plunge into the blazing, blinding suns of light; where art Thou? Our despair storms the darkness, and treads the pathless depths of mystery; where, oh, where art Thou?

Ah! my soul, not thus shalt thou find God, not thus shalt thou enter into thy rest. "The Righteousness which is of faith saith thus: Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? That is to bring Christ down; or, Who shall descend into the abyss? That is to bring Christ up from the dead. But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is the word of faith which we preach." Philip cries out: "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." Jesus answers, "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father?" "They shall call His name Immanuel." God with us! God in the midst of us! God on earth; among men; Himself a man; stooping to the depths; lifting to the heights; bearing humanity's burdens; sharing the world's woes; weeping human tears; fainting from the weakness of the flesh; pouring forth human blood, yet bringing into the weakness and guilt and misery of earth, bringing into the broken, bleeding life of man the condescension, the sympathy, the strength, the wisdom, the righteousness, the holiness, the love, the All of the Infinite God! Having this, what need we more? If God be not here, where shall we find Him? Christ! for this Infinite of Wisdom, Power, Righteousness, Love, where can thought find a Beyond? Christ! in presence of this Highest, where is the Higher can woo away our worship? Christ! what other Master can ever claim or win the allegiance of the soul that wears His yoke? Christ! what fuller, larger Perfection can ever lure our love from His supreme excellence? Christ! what can God be more unto us than Christ is? wherein can God do more for us than Christ does? The revelation of Christ solves forever the mystery of personality, whether in God or man. He puts man in possession of God. "He that hath the Son hath the Father." Christ puts man in possession of the divinest manhood. "As many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become sons of God."

The Divine Life in all its forms and manifestations thus centres in Christ, radiates from Him. Religion reaches its highest expression in this Divine-Human Life. Christianity means Christ. Theology in Scripture is first and chiefly Christology. "No man hath seen God at any time; God only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the father, He hath declared Him." The doctrine of God is the doctrine—that is, in true Scriptural usage, the teaching, the exegesis of Christ; not dogma about Christ, but the personal teaching of Christ Himself. And Christianity is not the teaching of Christ alone, but All of Christ. Not, I say again, something about Christ, but the Living Christ attesting Himself by His personal presence and His personal work in the world. Christianity is not a Thing, a dogma, a system, a process, but a person; Christianity, once and again, means Christ. The Church is not a Thing, a machine, an agency; the Church means Christ, for it is "the Fulness of Him that filleth all in all." The Bible is not a Thing, not the letter, the book, but the Spirit; "and the Lord is the Spirit." The Bible means Christ. The life of the Written Word is the living Personal Word. The truth means Christ, the whole of Christ. "Has Christ been divided?" Alas! Paul, yes. In Corinth? Aye, and in Antioch and Alexandria, in Rome and in Geneva, in the first century and in the nineteenth. We have divided the Living Christ into partial representations, half-living dogmas about Christ. We need once more to personalize our truths and our beliefs, to find in Christ the eternal incarnation, the living impersonation of the great verities and realities of our faith.

There is an earnest cry for a Christo-centric, and, if I may add an adjective, a Christo-metric theology. I heartily unite in the cry. Christ at the centre; Christ also as the radius, measuring with His infinitude every truth that radiates from that centre. No less a measure than the Christ-measure will suffice for any fact or truth of Christianity. Do we inquire respecting God's eternal purpose? Let us seek the interpretation and the metre in Christ. Sovereignty, election, predestination? Each is a paraphrase of Christ. Whatever Christ means, sovereignty means that. Wherever Christ reaches, grace reaches there. As large as Christ may be, so large is God's redemptive purpose. Atonement is no mere Divine mechanism, the skilful adjustment of expedients or balancing of equivalents. "HE is the propitiation for our sins." CHRIST in the breach, CHRIST filling the dreadful chasm occasioned by sin, CHRIST reaching all the way from the trembling culprit to the Throne with its everlasting thunders. Redemption is no mere formula, no prescription from a Divine pharmacopœia. Throughout it is Christ's personal efficiency. The measure of Christ, of His personality, of His personal force and life, that is the measure of redemption. He gives the breadth and length and height and depth of it. Redemption is Christ. He is the All of it. "Of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Mark well the statement: Christ was made Wisdom, and Christ was made Righteousness, and Christ was made Sanctification, and Christ was made Redemption. Our wisdom is not a creed, but a Person; our righteousness is not an abstract quality, but a Personal Reality; our sanctification is not an impersonal process, but a Personal Life; our redemption is not a supernatural life-saving apparatus, but a Personal God, putting Himself into the work of our salvation. Formulas, creeds, arrangements, institutions, things of whatever kind, are well enough in their place, but that place is secondary. Christ first—all the rest will follow.

"I am The Way, The Truth, and The Life." Brethren, as we start on the work of our new seminary year, let us take those words as our motto. Let us make Christ our way, our path in every line of research, the chart by which we determine every step, the method by which we strive for every goal, the philosophy of our life, of duty, and of destiny. Let us make Christ our Truth; Truth not as a logical abstraction, but as a Divine Impersonation; the Truth which is the core of all that is true, the pith of all integrity, the substance of all reality—that which we see with the eye of Christ, which we test by the mind of Christ, which we assimilate by the spirit of Christ. Christ in every truth, until it becomes an apocalypse of the ineffable Glory! Let it be our aim not to learn about Christ, but, in Pauline phrase, "to learn Christ." Let us make Christ our Life; the principle and law of our living, the sum of all our being, our having, our doing. Let all be from, through, in, unto Christ. Our surrender to others, our devotion to humanity, let it be for His sake. What we do for ourselves, let it be for Christ. Seek the most full and accurate knowledge—for Christ! the broadest culture—for Christ! the largest and most vigorous unfolding of all your powers and capacities—for Christ! Personal Christianity transformed into the grandest Christian personality—all for Christ's sake! "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee." Oh, for that waking! to come forth into that sunrise! Out of all our darkness and weakness, our numbness and deadness, into the light, the glow, the power, and the glory of that beatific CHRIST-SHINE! Thus to shine with the Christ be it your pre-eminent privilege and Service.

"What is this psalm from pitiable places
Glad where the messengers of peace have trod?
Whose are those beautiful and holy faces
Lit with their loving, and aflame with God?

"Aye unto these distributeth the Giver
Sorrow and sanctity, and loves them well,
Grants them a power and passion to deliver
Hearts from the prison-house and souls from hell?

"This hath He done, and shall we not adore Him?
This shall He do, and can we still despair?
Come, let us quickly fling ourselves before Him,
Cast at His feet the burden of our care,

"Flash from our eyes the glow of our thanksgiving,
Glad and regretful, confident and calm,
Then through all life, and what is after living
Thrill to the tireless music of a psalm.

"Yea, through life, death, through sorrow and through sinning
He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed;
Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ."

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

(*Condensed translation, by Rev. Professor George H. Schodde, Ph.D., Capital University, Columbus, O., of article entitled "Die Römische Zukunft Englands," by the Licentiat R. Buddensieg, Ph.D., of Dresden, in the "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift,"* 1890, *Nos.* 8 *and* 9.)

THE question as to which of the two great rival churches—the Roman Catholic or the Protestant—is making the more rapid strides toward securing the supremacy in the religious world has, in recent years, as is seen from the repeated discussions of the problem, become a burning issue of the day. These discussions have, among other things, brought to light an abundance of statistical data which have an all-important bearing on the solution of the vexed question; and in the end the statistical is the correct method by which to seek and secure this solution. Some of these data and figures are exceedingly instructive on the general bearings of the problem, and speak strongly and significantly for the relatively superior progress of Protestant Christianity. In the year 1885 the number of Christians was 452,000,000—namely, 92,000,000 of the Oriental Orthodox Church, 210,000,000 Roman Catholics, and 150,000,000 Protestants. According to the statistics of 1886, Europe contained 154,000,000 Roman Catholics, 85,000,000 Protestants, and 83,000,000 Greek Catholics. Since the numbers in 1786 were 80,000,000 Roman Catholics, 37,000,000 Protestants, and 40,000,000 Greek Christians, the past century shows a growth of 230 per cent on the part of Protestantism, 207 per cent on the part of Greek Catholicism, and only 192 per cent on the part of Roman Catholicism. Still more noteworthy are the facts when the Anglo-Saxon sections of the American continent are also taken into consideration. In 1786 Europe and America had a Protestant population of 39,700,000, and a Roman Catholic population of 110,190,000. In 1886 the figures were 134,500,000 Protestants and 201,000,000 Roman Catholics. From this it appears that the Protestants increased 3.36 times; the Roman Catholics only 1.81 times—*i.e.*, Protestantism made almost twice the advance that Roman Catholicism did.

These facts and their lesson are confirmed by sources that cannot be charged with denominational bias or prejudice. The London *Times* recently discussed in detail the religious statistics of the American continent, and came to the conclusion that proportionally Protestantism was advancing vastly more rapidly than Roman Catholicism. Ravenstein, who is generally regarded as a careful and reliable statistician, claims that proportionally Roman Catholicism has retrograded 23 per cent in America ; that in England the Romanism of Ireland is being absorbed by Protestantism with the same rapidity ; that the visions of Wiseman and Manning of a speedy conquest of England by Rome " has become more silly than ever."

Similar conclusions are reached by A. O. van Lennep and A. F. Schauffler, Dr. Dorchester in his " Religious Progress," J. L. Jones, of Dublin, Behm and Wagner in London, as also the *Statesman's Year Book* of London. At the Pan-Presbyterian Congress, held in 1885, in Belfast, an American speaker—Dr. Pomeroy—declared that had Roman Catholicism advanced in proportion to the growth of the population, the 6,000,000 of this communion in the United States ought to be 18,000,000 ; and that the system was for America " a damage and a disquiet more than a danger."

It should be remembered that these statistics are as a rule those collected by the State authorities, in which religious preferences or antagonisms had no voice. But Roman Catholic authors themselves cannot close their eyes to these "disagreeable" facts. In an article in the *Quarterly Review*, January, 1888, the author, a Protestant, not only claims that the relative retrogression of Roman Catholicism is a leading phenomenon of modern religious life not confined to England, and can be observed over the whole world as the result and Nemesis of the dearly purchased victory of Jesuitic Ultramontanism in that church ; but he also cites Roman Catholic authors in confirmation of his claims. Abbé Roca and F. Curci both demonstrate the correctness of this proposition—the former in his book " Le Christ le Pape et la Démocratie" (Paris, 1884) ; the latter in his work entitled " Nuova Italia ed. Vecchi Zelanti" (Florence, 1881) and in the " Vaticano Regio" (Florence, 1883). Both of these authors analyze especially the religious status of the intensely Roman Catholic countries of South America, France, Italy, Spain, Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria, and, on the other hand, the United States. Everywhere the Latin Church has sunk deeply ; thousands are turning to other churches. From their Catholic standpoints, both authors hope that the movement is only temporary in character, and that a reform in the administrative policy of the Vatican will remedy matters without touching the traditional doctrines of the Church.

Does England too share in this general trend and tendency ? From the claims of the Roman Catholic authorities and the tacit admission of many Protestants this would seem not to be the case ; but rather that the Romanization of the British Isles is only a question of time. Attention is repeatedly called to the stirring activity of the Roman hierarchy, restored in England in 1851 under Cardinal Wiseman ; to the successes in Scotland, where, notwithstanding the small proportion of Roman Catholics twelve years ago, there are now six bishoprics ; to the propaganda and shrewd political measures of the convert Manning, who as the head of Anglo-Romanism has the highest of aims and the wildest ambitions ; to the political and social regeneration of English Catholics since the Emancipation and the Reform bills of 1829 and 1832 ; to the great secessions in the fourth and fifth decade of this century, and to the Catholic tendencies of the State clergy shown by this movement ; to the successes of recent propaganda among the nobility ; and finally to the marvellous increase in churches and chapels, orders and brotherhoods, cloisters and priests. The old Catholics and the newly converted nobility (Norfolk, Bute, Ripon, and others), we are told, are more than willing to devote their immense wealth for the purposes of the Church ; and the vigorous strength of the recent converts is striking the State Church of England, feeling secure in her legal and traditional rights on the one side, and the Catholicizing tendencies of ritualism is endangering her existence on the other ; both Germany and France, too, have been drawn upon in late years for men and influence to control the Protestantism of England. All along the line, it is confidently asserted, the Jesuits, both those in the ranks of the converts, as also those who have come from abroad, have taken up the battle, and only the blind are not able to see on which banner this victory will be perched. Prominent voices within the Catholic fold are again and again reiterating these prophecies. The *Germania*, of Berlin, probably the ablest Catholic political daily published, claims that the noblest and best educated among the English are returning to the Church of Rome. The papal organ in Rome, the *Osservature Romano*, confidently predicts a speedy subjection of the chief stronghold of Protestantism. Zanardetti sees in the dying Protestantism of England the departed daughter of Jairus, but in the

Roman Church the awakened youth of Nain. Abbé Martin, in the *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1878, declares that the Protestantism of England is intellectually dying, just as he claims it is already dead in both France and Germany. As early as 1860, Cardinal Manning said, "The Protestantism of England is dead—dead to the quick!" Of course this last-mentioned voice of woe must be received *cum grano salis;* for the same Manning, only a few years before, on the occasion of the Third Provincial Council, held in 1859 in London, declared England to be the "head of Protestantism; the citadel of its strength." He declared that if Protestantism should be weakened in England it would easily be overthrown elsewhere; but England, regained for the faith, would be the Gospel teacher of the world. Only a few years later, when he had become a convert, he declared this same England to be no longer a "battle field, but a harvest field" for the Roman Catholic Church!

What are the facts of the case? These, and not rhetorical flourishes, must decide the question. There can be no doubt that, compared with the progress of the Catholic Church in earlier periods, this communion has socially and ecclesiastically made rapid advances in late decades. In the days of Elizabeth, Romanism in England seemed to be drawing its last breath. Between 1598 and 1688 the only representative of the hierarchy was an archpriest and apostolic vicar. In 1688 four vicarates were established—namely, London, Midland, Northern and Western Districts; in 1840 four more were added, namely, York, Lancaster, Welsh and Eastern District. Upon this basis Pius IX., in 1850, re-established the hierarchy. But few authentic documentary data are extant as to the numerical status of the Church at different periods. In 1596 there were 250 Roman Catholic priests in England; in 1608 there were 500; in 1636 there were 780. A report sent in 1635 by the Legate Panzain to the Pope states that of the 4,500,000 people in England, there were 150,000 Roman Catholics—*e.g.*, three and one third per cent of the entire population. Owing to the fanaticism of Charles II. and James II., which increased the hatred of Romanism and revived the old national cry of "No popery," this number in 1699 had decreased to 27,969, or one half of one per cent; and in 1745, according to reports sent the Propaganda in Rome, the four districts in England included only 58,635 Catholics, with 332 priests. In 1780 this number had already increased to 69,400, or about one per cent of the population; and when in 1792 there was a large exodus of Catholics from France, this number increased rapidly, so that in 1804 a single district—the Northern—reported more than 59,000 Catholics. In 1814 London reported 49,800. But the inner development was seriously hampered by the fact that the Church was the object of the bitter hatred that had grown steadily since the days of the Armada and the Guy Fawkes conspiracy; and the proposition of Sir George Saville, who in 1778 proposed the removal of the political disabilities of the Roman Catholics—at least in some of their worst features—was answered by the terrible Gordon riots. Since the beginning of the present century matters have radically changed in this regard.

In accordance with this changed condition, the status of the Church, numerically, socially, and otherwise, has shown at least a noteworthy growth. In the years 1850 to 1888 the number of bishops in England and Wales increased from 8 to 17; the priests from 826 to 2314; the religious houses from 17 to 587; the pupils in church schools from 24,000 to 280,000; the churches from 507 to 1304. In Scotland, which formerly had no bishop and only a handful of priests and a few chapels, there were in 1888 already 6 archbishops and bishops, 334 priests, 327 churches, and 46 religious houses. These data are taken from the *Quarterly Review* of 1888, p. 31. Dr. Schleicher, in the *Allgemeine Konservative Monatsschrift*, July, 1887, gives about the same figures. According to this statistician, in 1780 there were 200 chapels in England; in 1824 there were 346; in 1841 there were 400, together with 17 cloisters and 557 priests; in 1853 the figures were 616 chapels and churches, 88 cloisters, and 875 priests; in 1881 it was 810 churches and 1620 priests; in 1877 it was 1095 churches and 1892 priests; in 1884 it was 1259 churches, 29 seminaries, and 2198 priests.

What are the causes of this growth? Is it the result of inner strength or of a happy combination of outward circumstances? The way was prepared and the movement advanced by a series of parliamentary measures, which were occasioned by peculiar phases of political and religious thought. The Emancipation and Reform bills of 1829 and 1832 relieved the Catholic Church of a heavy burden; the Oxford movement made the attempt to prove the connection between the Protestant churches of England and the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, and in the years 1841–45 led about 400 of the clergy of the Established Church and a host of laymen into the Roman fold; and the high moral and intellectual character of these converts awakened a widely spread and deep respect for a religious system which could attract such men and thinkers. For it was impossible to imagine that men like John Henry Newman and R. J. Wilberforce could submit to a system in itself ridiculous and silly. The most important factor, however, in the rapid growth of Anglo-Romanism was the famine years of 1846–47 in Ireland, and the resultant immigration of Irish Roman Catholics into England. At that time men died on the streets and in their houses of hunger before the charity of England could reach them. Never before, not even in 1741, had Ireland suffered as it did then. Whoever was able to flee from the famine-stricken land did so. Hundreds of thousands went to England and Scotland, and many to America. Liverpool, and Glasgow, Chester and Sheffield, and afterward London were thronged with the multitudes of immigrants.

This movement effected an immense growth in the Roman Catholicism of England. From 1846–81 the population of Ireland decreased about 3,500,000. The census of 1881 showed that in Great Britain there were no fewer than 781,119 persons who had been born in Ireland. Of these, says Ravenstein, in the "Law of Migration," in the "Journal of the Royal Statistical Society," June, 1889, p. 247, fully 562,374 were in England alone, while the immigration from Great Britain to Ireland was only 97,710 from 1871–81, so that the absolute loss of Ireland was 689,400 persons, or 12.7 per cent of the entire population. Add to this immigration of the Irish into England the children born in England—since Irishmen usually marry young, and Irish families are very prolific—it is fair to say that since 1841 at least 250,000 to 300,000 must be added to the figures given above. The Irish almost to a man are Catholics, so that the growth of Roman Catholicism in England is not a growth of the Roman Catholic Church absolutely, but only relatively. *What this church has gained in England she has lost in Ireland. The figures have not been increased; they have only been transferred.* Just here is the source of the cardinal error of the Roman Catholic statisticians on this vexed question; and the fact of this immigration, as also the growth of Protestantism during this period, are entirely ignored.

Especially interesting and suggestive in this connection are the data furnished by a Catholic writer in the journal *Month*, July, 1885, in an article entitled "The Conversion of England." According to this writer, the Roman Catholic population of England and Wales in 1841 was 800,000; the total population 18,845,424; in 1885 the latter was 30,537,275—*i.e.*, an increase of 62 per cent. Had the Roman Catholic Church increased proportionally, it would, in 1885, have had an increase of 496,000. Not counting in the increase from the Irish immigration or the English secession or those gained by the propaganda, the Catholic Church ought then to have numbered 1,296,000 souls. As has been seen, the Roman Catholic immigration since 1845 was more than 1,000,000 souls; so that the Church ought to have had 2,396,000 souls. In reality, however, the number in 1885 was 1,362,760, and, according to the *Catholic Directory* for 1887, only 1,354,000. *This means that the Roman Catholic Church in England has in round numbers lost one million souls in these years.* That the decrease has not been greater is not caused by any intrinsic strength of that Church, but solely to a chain of local and other outward causes, chiefly the Celtic immigration.

The official organ of the English Roman Catholic hierarchy, the *Tablet*, in its issue of May 21st, 1887, openly confesses that "the annual losses of Anglo-Romanism vastly exceed its gains." This, undoubtedly, is correct, although the two authorities cited disagree as to the causes. According to the *Tablet*, the losses are caused in the ranks of the children, not through the workings of the new "School Board" system, but through the splendid organization of the Protestant propaganda (?), which, it is claimed, bribes the parents and coaxes away the children, so that the Protestant schools and institutes are overcrowded with Roman Catholic children, who are thus withdrawn from the influence of their own church.

The fact of the retrogression of the Roman Catholic Church in England is thus not denied. The data furnished on this subject in the *Month*, of July, 1885, had not, as that journal expressly states in its issue of October, 1886, been called into question by any one, although they had been significantly ignored all along the line of Catholic discussion. Gladstone remarks on the inherent power of Romanism in an article in the *British Quarterly Review*, 1879, that of the 25 parts into which one could divide the population of England and Wales, one part is Romish and 24 anti-Romish; and the one Romish part consists of at least 75 per cent Irish. Thus in the consciousness of the English people fully 96 per cent is anti-Romish. This judgment as to the relative power of Roman Catholicism as a factor and force in the public life of Great Britain expressed by a man who has studied the problem for many years, as Gladstone has, speaks volumes. And Gladstone's judgment is confirmed by no less an authority than Cardinal Manning himself. His own official calendar, the *Directory*, already cited, is evidence sufficient that the Romeward movement in England has come to a standstill. The following table tells its own story :

	Year.	Archbishops and Bishops.	Priests.	Churches and Stations.
England and Wales..	1888	17	2,314	1,304
	1889	15	2,380	1,306
Increase or decrease		— 2	+ 66	+ 2
Scotland.....	1888	6	334	327
	1889	5	341	324
Increase or decrease		— 1	+ 7	— 3

In a note it is especially remarked that in the list of priests, the invalids, superannuated, and others not in active service, as also a number of priests banished from other countries, have been included. In comparison with these data, the Protestant denominations show a remarkable growth in Great Britain, with the sole exception of the Quakers and the Unitarians, a total increase from 15.5 per cent in 1861 to 24.4 per cent in 1881, while Rome lags in the rear.

The same Archbishop of Westminster must furnish other telling evidences of this retrogression of his church. His *Directory* for 1888 gave the Catholic contingent in England and Wales as 1,354,000 ; for 1889 only 1,360,000—*i.e.*, an increase of only 6000 souls, and even these figures stand in no relation to the Catholic immigration from Ireland, France, Italy, and other countries ; while compared with the increase of the population it shows proportionally a large loss of Roman Catholics. For during the last six years the annual increase in the population has been about 380,000, or 1.5 per cent ; the increase in the Roman Catholic ranks in 1887–88 was just a little more than 0.5 per cent, or nearly one per cent less than the increase in the population. To keep up with the latter, the growth of the Church ought to have been 18,280 souls, and not 6000. And without the Irish contingent the decrease would even be greater. Similar data are secured from the statistics of marriages in England. These data naturally would favor the Catholics, since it is the habit of the Church not to report as Catholic those marriages performed by the non-Catholic clergy or by the Registrar-General. According to the *Statistical Reports*, there were, in the year 1845, before the Irish immigration, 1.95 per cent of marriages out of the whole number ; after the immigration this at once rose to 3.68 per cent ; in 1853, the year when the papal aggressions caused the Protestant panic in England, it was 5.09 per cent ; in 1865 it was 4.71 per cent ; in 1874 only 4.04 per cent ; in 1875, after the adoption of the Public Worship Regulation Bill, it again rose to 4.25 per cent, but in 1885 it went back to 4.13 per cent. Of the 197,745 marriages, 139,913 were performed by the clergy of the Established Church, and only 8162 by the Roman Catholic priests. The fact that fifty years ago the Roman Catholics constituted one third of the population, as they did in the days of Elizabeth, and have now decreased to one seventh, is no longer denied by Roman Catholics. According to the Catholic Year Book of Manning, the United Kingdom, in a population of 37,232,824, in 1889, the Catholic contingent numbered 5,600,000—*i.e.*, a little more than one seventh. This is not progress, but loss.

These statistics receive a renewed confirmation and elucidation from other data, which show that internally and in the life of the nation the Roman Catholic Church is proportionally not even the power, factor, and force to which its numerical strength would entitle it. Socially and politically it is not proportionally of prominence in the State and the public life of the nation. Of the 620 members of the English aristocracy, there are 40 Roman Catholic members, instead of 90, as could be expected, and of these 27 are old Catholic families and 13 are converts. Of the 495 members of the Lower House, there are only 5 Catholics ; among 79 from Scotland, not one. Of the 16 members constituting the Queen's Cabinet, there is but one Catholic. Of the 204 members constituting the Privy Council of Her Majesty, there are only 9 Catholics, whereas the ratio expected is 30. Figures like these can be cited in abundance. It is indeed true that grand Catholic cathedrals have been erected in late years, and many colleges and schools founded. But what does this signify, when, as a rule, these buildings are under mortgage from turret to foundation stone, and the attendance at the schools is so small ? There are Catholic colleges in England in which the attendance does not average two pupils to a professor.

On the other hand, the statistics of crimes tell a doleful story of the influence of this church. While in 1888 the Roman Catholics constituted 4.13 per cent out of the population of England and 3.90 per cent of London, and although all criminals not professing any religion are entered to the credit, or rather discredit of the Established Church, yet the percentage of Roman Catholic prisoners in most localities is from 15 to 20 and 40, and at places even 50. In two of the larger cities of England the female prisoners of Roman Catholic profession were more than three times as large as all the other females combined. The same facts are observable in Canada, Ireland, and elsewhere. In Ontario, although the Catholics constitute only 16 per cent of the population, yet they furnish 59.22 per cent of the criminals; in Toronto from 1873–86 the Catholic contingent in the prisons was 34,66 per cent, and 35.77 per cent of the female prisoners professed adherence to this church.

ON THE ANCIENT BELIEFS IN A FUTURE STATE.

BY W. E. GLADSTONE.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), October, 1891.

It is a circumstance of real literary interest that there should be published in Calcutta a periodical devoted to the promotion of Christian learning, under the auspices of the Oxford Mission to India, and depending upon the contributions of Native as well as of British writers; and further, that it should attract the support of so distinguished a Hebraist and Biblical scholar as Professor Cheyne. An article by this Professor * furnishes the point of departure for the following remarks upon a subject of interest alike in itself and in its relation to other and yet wider subjects.

It is the opinion of Professor Cheyne that there is a doctrine of immortality in the Old Testament. He finds it in Psalms xvi., xvii., xxxvi., xlix., lxiii., lxxiii. He thinks he has proved that these Psalms were composed "during the latter part of the Persian rule over Palestine." In the Review, however, he does not enter upon the date of these Psalms: but states a principle which serves as a convenient text for a discussion of the subject touched by it. The principle is this *:—

> It involves a much greater strain upon faith to hold that the wonderful intuition of immortality was granted so early as the times of David and Solomon, than to bring the Psalms in question down to the late Persian age.

The general doctrine which appears to be here conveyed is to something like the following effect: that the human race advances through experience, heredity, and tradition, from infancy toward maturity; that the mind, subjected to these educative agencies, undergoes a process of expansion, and becomes capable in a later age of accepting intelligently what in an earlier age it could not have been fit to receive. In my opinion such a doctrine requires an important qualification; because moral elements, as well as those which are intellectual, go to form our capability of profitable reception, and because it depends upon the due proportion and combination of the two whether an advance in the understanding shall or shall not bring us nearer to the truth. But, for the sake of argument, let the doctrine stand. If it stands, it sustains a presumption that knowledge with respect to a future life, after once being imparted, improved in the early stages of human history with the lapse of time. But, as yet, the doctrine rests only on the footing of an argument *a priori*. From this there actually lies an appeal to the argument derivable from positive testimony. Does our information with regard to the religions of the ancients lead us to believe that the sense of a future world advanced, or that it receded, as "the years rolled into the centuries," and as civilization assumed more positive and consolidated forms? Be it remembered all along that the question before us is not whether the knowledge of a future state was evolved by man subjectively from his own thoughts, or was divinely imparted. The present question is only whether, when once received, this particular article of religious knowledge progressively advanced along with the general growth of intelligence, or whether, on the contrary, it declined.

I am not willing, however, to quit altogether this question of presumption *a priori* without drawing an inference in parallel subject matter, which appears to me relevant, and rather strong.

If the advance of civilization imported

---

* *Indian Church Quarterly Review*, April 1891, No. 2, p. 127. (Calcutta: Oxford Mission Press; London: Masters, 78 New Bond Street.)

* *Indian Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1891, No. 2, p. 128.

the growth of intelligence, and if the advance of intelligence quickened the mental eye for the perception of things beyond the material range, this quickening, it is obvious, would be available, not for the future only, but for the unseen world at large, both as to a standing consciousness of its existence, and as to a readiness to acknowledge and accept the presence on earth, and in human affairs, of any beings by whom it is supposed to be peopled.

It is intelligible, indeed, that a distinction may be drawn between a belief in Providence, and a belief in Theophany, or in the marvellous under any of its many forms. Let us accept this distinction. It will still, I apprehend, remain undeniable that the onward movement of ancient civilization did not in practice enliven, but rather, on the contrary, tended to weaken or efface the belief in the doctrine of Providence; in an unseen but constant superintendence and direction of human affairs by the Divine power. I take Homer and Herodotos as two men who, while separated in time by a number of centuries even greater than the four which the historian allows, were both of them, according to the lights and opportunities of their day, pious men. But how far stronger, more familiar, and more vivid, is the sense of a Providence truly divine, of the *theos* and *theoi* quite apart from polytheistic limitations, in Homer than in Herodotos. Take another step, say of half a century, from Herodotos to Thucydides; and you encounter a work of history generally as perfect in its manipulation as the highest productions of Phidias; but a work, also, the author of which had lost all touch of the religious idea, and could hardly be said to see, what even Agnosticism thinks it sees, the fact of a mighty or an almighty power working behind an impenetrable curtain. Well: during the interval of time between Homer and Thucydides the progress of Greece in civilization had been immense; but she had lost her grasp of the doctrine of Providence, of the nearness of deity to man, of its living care for human affairs and interests. And whatever may be said of the speculations of Plato, an intellect more muscular, more comprehensive, and more entirely Greek—the intellect of Aristotle—places the element of deity at a distance from human life as wide as that of the Lucretian heaven. This was not, evidently, because of a decline in intellectual capacity. But the aggregate of the influences operative upon human perception had enfeebled the sense of the unseen *present.* The presumption, though (thus far) no more than a presumption, herewith arises that it would also enfeeble the sense of the unknown future.

Now let us pass on to the direct evidence available upon the subject before us: and I will recite at once the conclusions which the facts, as far as we know them, seem to me to recommend. They are as follows:—

1. That the movement of ideas between the time of civilization in its cradle, and the time of civilization in its full-grown stature, on the subject of future retribution, if not of a future existence generally, was a retrograde, and not a forward, movement.

2. That there is reason, outside the Psalter, to think that the Old Testament implies the belief in a future state, as a belief accepted among the Hebrews; although it in no way formed an element of the Mosaic usages, and cannot be said to be prominent even in the Psalms.

3. That the conservation of the truth concerning a future state does not appear to have constituted a specific element in the divine commission intrusted to the Hebrew race, and that it is open to consideration, whether more was done for the maintenance of this truth in certain of the Gentile religions.

As regards the first of these propositions, which is one of fact only, we seem to labor under this great difficulty, that the Greek or Olympian religion is the only religion of antiquity which we can trace at all minutely in its different phases through the literature and records of the country; whereas it is by no means a religion which distinctively enshrines the doctrine of a future state. In the case of Assyria, while we might hope for testimony extending over a lengthened period, the destiny of mankind after death did not, according to Canon Rawlinson, occupy a prominent place in the beliefs of the people.* And if we turn to the Egyptian, and the Iranian or Persian religions, the means of comparing their earlier with their later states seem to be very incomplete though not wholly insignificant. The Persian religion in its earlier condition was one of a dualism of abstract conceptions, and it progressively developed them into rival personalities. In the course of time, the country came under the influence of Magianism. To the early Zoroastrianism, there had been attached a strong belief in a future state of a retributive character. But when Herodotos† wrote his account of the Persian religion he described the Magian system and its elemental worship, and seems to have known little or nothing of the older Persian scheme, unless on the negative side, where it rejected temples, images, and altars. The older form had now apparently come to be the religion of the Court, rather than of the people.[*] The religion of abstract ideas had lost ground ; that which was sacerdotal and pantheistic had gained it. I see thus far no sign of progress in the doctrine of a future state. The inference rather is that it was passing into the shade.

---

* *Ancient Religions*, p. 77.

† *Herod.* i. 131, 138; iii. 16.

The historical relations, however, between Greece and the Persian empire were so important that, probably on this account, a large number of the Greek writers, Aristotle himself included, gave attention to the religion of the great antagonist whom Alexander finally overthrew. It was, most probably, the later condition of that religion, to which their accounts relate. The most important of them, from Herodotos to Plutarch, are textually cited or described in Dr. Haug's Essays on the Parsees.[†] No one of them, except that ascribed to Theopompos,[‡] makes any reference to the future state. We shall see presently what a place this doctrine occupied in the earlier times of Zoroastrianism.

The political relations of Greece with the Egyptian empire appear to have been important in the prehistoric period ; but the notices of them are few and undetermined. In the great literary age, they were of secondary concern. It has become well known, from the monuments, how powerfully the doctrine of the future life was developed in the archaic religion of Egypt. It was not to be expected that the classical period should here supply us with information such as it has furnished with respect to the religion of Persia. But Herodotos was led, partly by the peculiarities of the case of Egypt generally, and partly from his acknowledging a certain early connection between its religion and that of Greece, to devote more than forty sections of his second Book to his account of it.[§] Yet that principal account does not contain one word of reference to future retribution, or of belief in the existence of the soul after death ; although in another portion of his work we shall see that he mentions the primitive Egyptian teaching.

The fifteenth Satire of Juvenal censures in the strongest terms the Egyptian religion of his own day, at once debased and fanatical. He then closes the satire in an ethical strain of remarkable loftiness ; and it might be thought that, had future retribution been a living and prominent portion of the Egyptian religion of his day, he could hardly have avoided making some reference to it, especially as he appears to have been himself a believer in the unseen world.[*] But in the *Isis et Osiris* of Plutarch, I find a passage which, if I understand it rightly, signifies that the Egyptian priests of his time had become somewhat ashamed of the old definite, circumstantial teaching of their religion concerning Osiris,[†] as the judge of each dead man and lord of the Underworld, in that it savored too much of matter, or was in some way behind the age. Again, Iamblichus, writing in the age of Constantine, and discussing the Egyptian religion, assigns to it a high rank, but does not seem to include the idea of a future state among its motive powers.[‡] Thus, then, the doctrine of the future state, if viewed as a working portion of religion, lost force and did not gain it with the lapse of time under the Egyptian system, which had been so famous for its early inculcation.

Undoubtedly this seems to have been the case also with the Greeks. The genius of that extraordinary people does not appear at any time to have qualified or inclined them to adopt with anything like earnestness or force that belief, which is so marked in the religions of Egypt and of Persia at an early date. Homer is here our principal authority : and what we gather from the *Odyssey* is that the Underworld of the Poet is evidently an exotic and imported conception, made up of elements which were chiefly supplied from the religions of Egypt and Assyria. We may also observe that the place he finds for it lies in the outer zone of his geography, beyond the great encircling River Okeanos. In the *Iliad,* the great national and patriotic poem of Homer, the doctrine of the future life appears only in the case of Patroklos, and there only as a vague, remote, and shadowy image. The Egyptian name for the kingdom of the dead was Amenti, which seems to reappear in the Greek Rhadamanthos. There is a singular circumstance associated with one of the discoveries of Schliemann at Mycenæ. In a tomb fifteen feet six inches in length, and only five feet six inches in breadth, the bodies of full-grown men are laid not along but across the space, being thus squeezed in the strangest manner. But they were in this way made to lie east and west, and toward the west: and such we learn was the position in which the Egyptians laid their dead.* Minos is also introduced to us as a personage in the Underworld of the *Odyssey,* and he is engaged in administering justice. So far we follow the Egyptian idea. But the Greek spirit took the heart and life out of the realm of Osiris. Minos sits, so to speak, not as a criminal but as a civil judge: he does not punish the guilty for their misdeeds on earth, but simply meets the wants of a community for an arbitrator of determining authority in their affairs.† No one, whom we can certainly call a compatriot of Homer's, appears in the Underworld as under penal suffering: not, for instance, Aigisthos, or Klutaimnestra, who might have been fit subjects for it. In the ethical code of Homer, there is no clear recognition of penalty for sin; except it be for perjury upon the breach of great public pacts; and this penalty is made applicable to gods and men alike. The only case, in which he associates the existence after death with happiness, is that of Menelaos. Menelaos is among the purest characters of the Poems: but the reason given for his fortunate lot is, that he was the husband of Helen, and son-in-law of Zeus.‡ It is, however, plain that there must have been a general belief in a future state among his contemporaries, or we should not find it as we now find it embodied and developed in a poem essentially popular.

---

[*] Rawlinson's essay, in his *Herod.* i. 426–31.

[†] *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees*, by Dr. Martin Haug. Edited and enlarged by Dr. West. (London, 1890.) Essay I. pp. 3-16.

[‡] P. 9.

[§] Vol. ii. 35–76.

[*] Sat. ii. 149 *sqq.*

[†] *Plut. de Is. et Os.* 382. 37. τοῦτο, ὅπερ οἱ νῦν ἱερεῖς ἀφοσιούμενοι καὶ παρακαλυπτόμενοι μετ' εὐλαβείας ὑποδηλοῦσιν.

[‡] Iamblichus *de Mysteriis*, 159-9. (Lugduni 1577.)

It was, then, an article of the national belief in the heroic age. What became of it in the classical period? It faded out of notice. There grew up instead of it that remarkable idea of the self-sufficiency of life, which became a basis for Greek existence. Apart from particular exceptions, and from the mysteries, which remained always only mysteries for the people, things temporal and things seen affixed all round a limit to human interests. The Underworld could not have been treated as it is treated by Aristophanes, in any country except one where for the mind of the people at large it had ceased to have a really religious existence. The disputed existence which it obtained in some of the philosophical schools is itself a witness to the fact that for man as such, in the wear and tear of centuries, the idea had not, upon the whole, gained ground, but lost it, among the most intellectual people ever known.

Have we not then to wait for the evidence which is to show that the doctrine of immortality would have been too great a strain for the Hebrews at the reputed era of the composition of the Psalms under David and Solomon, and that it was mercifully withheld from primitive man who could only feed on milk, to be administered as strong meat to a later and more mature generation?

Even were such evidence to be forthcoming on behalf of the general proposition, we should still have to ask how it is known, or why it is to be believed, that the idea of immortality was made known to the Hebrews from Persian sources? The Captivity was not a Persian, but a Babylonian captivity. The advent of Persian power brought it to a close. It was Magianism, rather than Zoroastrianism, that the political influence of Persia at the time would have been likely to impart. But what proof is there, during the period which followed the return, and preceded the Greek supremacy, of this kind of Persian influence over the Hebrew People? The adoption of Persian words in the popular language was a general fruit of Persian power, and is said not to have included subjects of religion.* But I pass on to the second of the three heads which have been proposed.

II.

The six Psalms, indicated by Professor Cheyne as those in which the hope of immortality may perhaps be traced, all lie within the first, that is, speaking generally, the older portion of the Psalter. For those who suppose them to have belonged to the worship of Solomon's temple, and who are glad to follow Professor Cheyne when he proves that they embody the hope of a future life, it would be somewhat anomalous to believe that, while the public service taught this doctrine, no mark of it had been left, outside the Temple walls, upon the historical books of the Old Testament, or in the sense of the people. True, the doctrine of a future existence is not prominent upon the face of the older Scriptures. Neither, it might perhaps be said, is it very conspicuous in the speech and actions of the Pharisees in the Gospels, who notwithstanding are known to have held it. But yet we should expect to find some traces of it: and our Lord has actually taught us that it is conveyed in the declaration that God was the God of Abraham and of Isaac and Jacob; a saying of which the force can hardly be escaped by the plea that He was interpreting ancient lore in conformity with the current opinion of the people.

---

* Schliemann's *Mycenæ*, xxxii. iii. and 295.

† *Odyssey*, xi. 568–71.

‡ *Ibid.* iv. 569.

* Haug, p. 5.

In the Authorized, and also in the Revised, Version of Gen. v. 24, we read the words,

> And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.

The rendering of the Septuagint is that he pleased God, and that he was not found, for God transposed or transplanted him. The natural sense of the words taken from the Hebrew is the necessary sense of the Greek: and it appears that it is adopted by the various Targums.[*] Is it possible rationally to put any interpretation on this verse, except one which conveys the idea just as the Septuagint has put it, and shows that life in the unseen world was a conception accepted both by the author of the verse, and by those for whom it was written? Such is the sense given to it in Ecclesiasticus xliv. 16 and in Heb. xi. 5. Such is the sense given by Bishop Browne in the Speaker's Bible, by Fuller in the Student's Bible, by Bishop Patrick adopted into Mant's Bible, by Grotius, Fagius, and others [†] in the *Critici Sacri*. But I will not pursue further this enumeration in a case which does not seem to leave room for doubt. I will only add that the legend of Ganymede, according to the beautiful form which it bears in the *Iliad*,[‡] with just so much of descent from the loftiness of the old Hebrew tradition as we might have expected, seems to owe its origin to the translation of Enoch.

There seems to subsist a vague, but widespread, impression that the Hebrews of ancient times were not made aware of the existence after death. In the direction of this untrue notion, two concessions I believe, and two only, can be made. The first is, that the future state is nowhere proclaimed by Moses. The second, that a national and public dispensation of rewards and punishments, purely temporal, may have had a certain tendency to throw into the shade in the individual mind the doctrine of our surviving corporal dissolution. And, for us of this day, it is possible that the argument of Warburton in the *Divine Legation* may have been made instrumental to consequences for which its author is not really responsible. What he argued was, that Moses never would have promulgated his system, devoid as it was of sanctions from the doctrine of a future state, unless he had been divinely commissioned and inspired. But around this fair and probable argument there has gathered a varied group of errors, with this main one at the head, that the religion taught by Moses was the entire religion of the patriarchs and of the ancient Hebrew nation; or that at the least it was, as a religion, an advance upon the patriarchal religion, a kind of halfway house between it and Christianity, so that to look beyond it for any truths of Hebrew belief, which it does not contain, is to recede from the light into the darkness.

There are, indeed, delivered by Moses certain broad enunciations of principle, which appertain to the habitual religion of the individual and may truly be called spiritual commandments. In part, the injunctions of the Decalogue have this character; but they do not seem to mark the point of loftiest elevation reached by the declarations of Moses. The principle of love is not expressly contained (unless as to parents only) in the ten precepts; although room, so to speak, is made for it to occupy, by the exclusion of false gods, by the re-injunction of the sabbatical rest—for it may, after the Assyrian discoveries,[*] with increased confidence be described as a revival—and by the negatives so rigorously put upon crime and appetite. But may it not be said that those negative forms, and that revival of the sabbath, of themselves point to something higher? The acme of the declarations of Moses appears to be reached first in Leviticus (xix. 18), where it is proclaimed that a man is to love his neighbor as he loves himself; and further, in Deuteronomy (vi. 5), that he is to love the Lord *his* God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength. These injunctions fill the space left open by the Decalogue. Is there any reason for regarding them as novelties, first taught from or after Sinai? It is easy indeed to comprehend the appropriate wisdom of their solemn republication after the children of Israel had so long dwelt in the midst of a corrupt idolatry, and so far as we know without the advantage either of a fixed code or of positive institutions,[†] to cherish and keep alive the truths which their fathers had possessed. True, these great principles of religion are nowhere taught in the Book of Genesis as precepts; but neither is belief in God, nor any other part of the religion of the patriarchs, set out in a creed or a code. We only see it live and work: and are not these great principles of love to God and man the very same principles, which made Enoch too good to remain under the conditions of an earthly life, and which fashioned the faultless character of Joseph?

---

[*] Bishop Browne, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loc.*

[†] *In loco* by each of these respectively.

[‡] *Iliad*, xx. 232-5,

[*] Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries*, p. 12.

[†] It is at any rate remarkable that the reason given for the release of the children of Israel from Egypt is (Exod. vii. 16; viii. 20) that they may serve God in the wilderness; and again it appears, from Exod. viii 20-23, that they could not perform the proper sacrifices to God in Egypt, but must go into the wilderness for the purpose.

The Mosaic law was neither the full enunciation of a personal religion for individuals, nor an instrument for educating a nation into counsels of perfection. In truth, it dealt with the nation rather than with its component members, and laid down precepts for each of these only in so far as it was necessary to maintain them as a community separated from the rest, to testify against idolatry by the worship of one God, to exhibit through its ritual and sacrificial system the character of sin, to cherish the expectation of a coming deliverance, and in the meantime, and until the fulness of time should come, to gird about an encircled space, "a vineyard in a very fruitful hill;" * within which a spiritual worship, and the lives befitting it, might have full and unhindered growth upon the basis traditionally known to the fathers of the race.

But it may without difficulty be shown that, while the Mosaic law was a law of temporal sanctions only, the people did not fall so low, in the scale either of nature or of grace, as to suppose that the life of man is at an end when his remains are laid in the ground: that they did not sink so far beneath the other nations of remote antiquity, none of which appear to have entertained that dishonoring and dangerous belief, though they varied from others in the prominence which their systems assigned to the positive doctrine on the subject. It might perhaps be sufficient to cite the care taken and cost incurred by them in the sepulture of the dead, as proofs that when burial was accomplished they did not think all was over. But more pointed proofs are not deficient. Let us take, for instance, the case of the prophet Elijah. In his lifetime, he must have been a character as conspicuous as the sovereigns of the country; while, after his death, it appears that a living tradition of his greatness made him the special type of the prophetic office, both in the mouth of Malachi, and when four more centuries had elapsed at the Transfiguration of our Saviour.† It will not, I suppose, be disputed, that the Hebrews received as true the history of his being corporally transported into heaven: an occurrence, which we are specially informed that fifty men of the sons of the prophets stood to witness from a distance, while Elijah and Elisha passed over Jordan together.‡ Is it possible that a people, who believed this prophet had thus been carried up from earth, believed also that with that miraculous transportation his existence came to an end?

Still more remarkable, upon the point now before us, is the proof of the popular belief afforded by the practice of necromancy among the people. The whole basis of such a practice lies in an established popular conviction that the spirits of the departed not only existed, but existed in a state of susceptible faculty, and might be moved, by influences exercised in this world, to make apparition before the eyes of the living. It appears, indeed, that this practice was viewed by the governing powers with jealousy, for the woman, who had "the familiar spirit," urged, when application was made to her, that it was dangerous for her to comply, because Saul had "cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizard out of the land." * Under such circumstances, as the prohibitions of the Mosaic law were no dead letter, the profession of the witch could only be kept alive by strong inducements; and what strong inducement could there be, except a curiosity of the people for direct information about the dead, which involved the certainty of their continuing existence?

King Saul finds himself placed in desperate straits by the attack of the Philistine army, at the time when David was serving in its ranks. Samuel, the mainstay of the State, had recently died, and had been solemnly mourned for by the people. Saul was driven, in order to obtain the benefit of indispensable counsel, to seek the aid of those whom he had attempted to extirpate. Failing to obtain light upon the emergency by any of the ordinary means, he requires his servants to find for him a woman with a familiar spirit. He is referred to such a person, who lives at Endor. He repairs to her in disguise, evidently believing that, though she would of course regard the king as her enemy, yet, if he could pass for one of the people, she would meet his desire, and evoke the spirit of the dead in the regular way of business. She recognizes the king, and he has to give her a promise of indemnity. Samuel is then brought up; and a scene is reported to have taken place, in which his spirit addresses King Saul, and, in the exercise of the gift of prophecy, announces that his kingdom was to depart from him. Such is the narrative, which would appear to imply the reality of the apparition. Both the rabbinical commentators, however, and the Christian writers,

---

* Isaiah, v. 1. † Malachi iv. 2; Mark ix. 4. ‡ 2 Kings ii. 7.

* 1 Sam. xxviii. 4, 9.

are divided upon this question down to the present day.* But this is a matter wholly apart from the present argument, which simply rests upon the fact that there was a general belief in such apparitions, a belief extending even to the king upon the throne. The measures taken by Saul for the suppression of necromancy and all witchcraft, may have been adopted in obedience to the stringent and repeated prohibitions contained in the law.† Those prohibitions do not expressly name intercourse with the dead, but this, I apprehend, cannot be excluded from the general scope of the profession; and, if so, the number and nature of the prohibitions is a fresh testimony to the popular belief in the existence of the soul after death, and seems to indicate its continuity among the Israelites from the time of Moses onward.

It is not now the question how far this belief was developed, or how far it was operative on conduct. We have no proof from Scripture that it implied the punishment of bad men in the other world, though the cases of Enoch and Elijah may fairly stand as indicating the rewards of those who were pre-eminently good. Neither again in the Psalms is the penal part of the doctrine of a future life as plainly discernible, as the portion which concerns the rest and peace of saints. As we see from Homer, the ideas of future retribution and of future existence have not a necessary, though they have an appropriate, connection. My proposition amounts simply to this: that, as in the time of our Lord, so in the pre-exilic periods, the Hebrew race in general did not believe in the extinction of the soul at death: and that, as to the completeness and moral power of this belief, we do not seem to have evidence requiring or entitling us to draw any very broad distinction in favor of one period as against another. Thus much I have admitted: that, as the theocratic system of Moses, aided by the order of prophets, worked in the earlier time in a manner more legible, so to speak, by the people, than after the exile, and as this may have tended somewhat to confine or weaken the habit of mind which resorts to future sanctions, so the post-exilic period, or that large part of it which was passed in a condition of political dependence, may to some extent have been favorable to a more active sense of the future life. But nowhere does a necessity seem to arise for supposing that the Jews received any large infusion of positive doctrine on the subject of a future state from the circumstances of the Babylonish captivity, or from Persian influences after its close.

III.

If, then, it is admitted, even by those who favor the argument followed in these pages, that the doctrine of a future state nowhere entered into the prescriptions of the Mosaic law, and is not directly declared and inculcated in the earliest Scriptures, it probably subsisted among the Hebrews rather as a private opinion, than as an obligatory belief. And it obviously follows that it did not form a part of those truths, or of that system, which the Jewish people were appointed to maintain and to transmit. It was not divinely intrusted to them, as part and parcel of their special work. Was there, then, any other, even if it were an indeterminate, provision among the nations for the conservation of this belief?

Undoubtedly, in this wayward world of ours, truth commonly has error on its borders, and in the neighborhood of religious beliefs, in themselves just and weighty, there may lie all round a set of opinions, more or less openly avowed, which, if associated with them at all in the order of thought, are no better than their spurious offspring. Thus, from the Christian point of view, it was a great fact of religion that, long before the Advent, and indeed from the outset of human history, God had selected a portion or portions of the human race for high and special purposes to which He perceived their adaptation. From the call of Abraham onward, we perceive that great and wonderful selection of his posterity, which proclaims itself to the world down to this very day. But upon such a positive truth men have allowed themselves to graft the negative assertion, that the rest of mankind were outcasts, without any sign of the Divine favor, or of possessing a share in the designs of the Almighty for the education of mankind.

It is likely that this misconception may have been extended and strengthened by the great movement of the sixteenth century. That movement threw the mind of the reformed communities upon Scripture, as a bulwark of defence against the ruling authorities of the Latin Church; and this not upon the New Testament only, which records the final breaking down of the wall of severance, but upon Scripture as a whole; so that, especially within the energetic sweep of Scottish Presbyterianism, and of

---

* See Grotius, Muneterus, and others, in the *Critici Sacri*: and of recent commentators, Adam Clarke, the Speaker's Bible, the Student's Bible, Mant, and Thomas Scott. Modern English commentators for the most part affirm the reality.

† Exodus xxii. 18; Levit. xix. 21, xxx. 6; Deut. xviii. 10.

Puritanism in England, the Old Testament was lifted more nearly to a level with the New. In details the Old Testament itself testifies, by hundreds of passages, to the active providential relation with persons and races outside the confines of the Abrahamic race and the Mosaic dispensation. The dealing with Melchisedec, the marriage of Joseph to the daughter of the priest of On,* and of Moses to the daughter of the priest of Midian,† the assignment of portions of country in the promised land to Canaanites, the remarkable history of Balaam, the beautiful episode of Ruth the Moabitess, the explicit language of the Psalms, and of the prophets, among whom Jonah had no other mission than to Nineveh —all these circumstances, which might be stated with very wide development, ought to have made the enlarged knowledge of Scripture a guarantee against narrow conceptions. But the resort to the sacred volume was of necessity in a great degree polemical; and the polemical frame of mind, however effective for its immediate purposes, however inevitable in the case before us, is too commonly fatal to enlargement and impartiality of view. The notion of a race preferred over other races, and employed in a particular case to administer punishment for depravity, was magnified into an absolutely exclusive love, and a not less sweeping condemnation or neglect.

It was a breaking of new ground when, in 1815, there was published an essay of Bishop Horsley's which treats of Messianic prophecy and of various portions of truth preserved among the heathen. Among these were included the immortality of the soul; and the Bishop, in anticipation of researches to come, makes reference to the sacred books of Persia.‡

It has been, indeed, the belief of the Christian Church and community, that the history not only of the chosen people but of the world throughout a very wide circle was, before the coming of our Lord, a grand *præparatio evangelica.* In some respects, the forms of this preliminary discipline were obvious enough. The conquests of Alexander secured for that marvellous instrument of thought, the Greek language, such a currency as, when backed by the influence which in the West had been acquired by its literary monuments, dispensed as it were with the day of Pentecost in the general action of the Christian Church, and supplied a channel of communication and a vehicle of worship available in most parts of the civilized world. What the genius of Greece was to secure in the region of thought, the vast extension of the Roman empire effected in the world of outward fact. It prepared the way of the Lord and made the rough places plain. Immediately before and after the advent, it levelled the barriers between separate and hostile communities, and for the first time established the idea of police in its highest form, and made peaceable and safe intercourse everywhere possible among men. Everywhere it was, as with us in Britain: "when the Roman left us," then it was that again "the ways were filled with rapine."*

Another stage on the way to the comprehansion of a truth of the widest reach and highest value was attained, when the world began to be sensible of its debt to ancient Greece. It may well be, to us of this day, a marvel to conceive how it could have been that, down to a time when poetry and the arts had already achieved the most splendid progress, the Christian world remained insensible to the superlative dignity and value of the ancient Greek literature and art. In Italy at least, the compositions of the Greeks must all along have survived in numerous manuscripts. But the Greeks had not merely produced a certain number, not after all a very large one, of great works of mind and hand: they had established habits of mind and of performance, alike in art, in letters, and in philosophy, such that they furnished the norm for civilized man in the ages to come. Hellenism became a capital fact for the race. Greece supplied the intellectual factor under the new dispensation of Christianity, as truly as the Hebrew race supplied us with the spiritual force which was to regenerate the heart and will of man. And this was done for millions, who knew little but the name either of Greeks or Jews. And if this transcendent function was assigned to the Hellenic race, outside the bounds of any continuing revelation, the question surely arises whether other races may, through their forms of religion or otherwise, have made their special contributions to the fulfilment of the grand design for establishing the religion of the Cross, and for giving it an ascendency which is already beyond dispute, and which may be destined even to become, in the course of time, universal over the surface of the earth.

The last, and in a much higher degree the present, centuries have opened the door to a knowledge wholly without precedent of these ancient religions, which took and long held their place in conjunction with advanced civilization and commanding political power. I suppose that Sir William Jones and Anquetil du Perron will be forever famous among the pioneers in this great undertaking, the one for his services with regard to the Vedic, and the other to the Zoroastrian religion. Besides the vast subsequent progress in the spheres of knowledge there opened, the interpretation of the Egyptian and the Assyrian monuments has effected nothing less than a revolution with regard to the archaic religions of the earliest great empires of the world. It is of the deepest interest to examine whether in any and what particulars, now recognized by Christians as undoubted portions of revealed truth, those religions were more advanced or more enlarged than the religion of the favored race. The question is hardly one entangled with controversy. No doubt, if it be found that these extraneous and independent religions taught in any point more fully than the Hebrews what Christians now acknowledge, this will be for Christians a new and striking proof that in the infancy of the race of Adam, and before its distribution over the earth, the Almighty imparted to it precious knowledge, which it could hardly have discovered, and was but indifferently able to retain. But those, who view religions as simply the formations gradually effected by our own unaided powers, from fetichism upward, will have their solution ready also : the diversities of the onward movement, as between one race and another, will for them only show variety in tastes and in capacity for progress. Let me proceed to an example.

---

* Gen. xiv. 18; xlii. 50.

† Ex. ii. 21.

‡ *A Dissertation on the Prophecies of the Messiah dispersed among the Heathen,* pp. 16, 115. The essay, which was posthumous, is wider than its title.

* Tennyson's *Guinevere.*

It is a favorite observation with the negative writers on religion, that the narrative of the temptation in the Garden of Eden lends no support to the doctrine of the existence of Satan or of devils, inasmuch as the seduction of Eve from obedience is ascribed simply to the serpent. The personal action of the evil spirit is mentioned in several places of the Old Testament. But there is no identification of him with the serpent of Paradise ; and further, there is no distinct intimation that he came to be what he was through a rebellion against God followed by a fall from heaven. The magnificent description by Isaiah [*] of the fall of Lucifer from above, though it may well serve for a description of such a rebellion, is primarily referable to the king of Babylon. It is only passages of the New Testament, and these not systematically combined in its text, which inform us that he was a fallen spirit, once in conflict with the servants of the Most High. We hear nothing, in fact, from the Old Testament of the War in heaven. But while this awful tradition was waiting for its sanction from the pens of Apostles, and was apparently unknown to the Hebrews, there was sufficient recollection of it in the heathen religions. We are told of it as late as by Horace.[*] Homer gives it us in various forms—of the Titans punished in Tartaros,[†] of the Giants,[‡] and perhaps also in the attempt of Otos and Ephialtes to scale the heavens.[§] Still, we had not until recently had easy means of carrying the tradition further back into remote antiquity. But the Assyrian monuments, though as yet but partially unveiled, furnish a tablet,[‖] thought by Mr. Smith to be one of those about which Berosus states that they were buried before the Deluge, and disinterred after it had subsided. This tablet contains the story of the seven wicked gods or spirits, who conspired together to make war against Hea. And Hea sends his son Merodach to put them down, even as Horace in his fine ode assigns to Apollo a capital share in quelling the attack of the Giants.[¶] Probably much more evidence could be collected to the same effect. But what has been said is sufficient as an instance in support of my general proposition, namely, there may be cases where the independent religions of antiquity have enshrined in very pointed forms traditions justly to be called primeval, which have obtained no clear notice in the Old Testament, but which subsequently appear as authorized portions of the New. If this be true, then it is surely also true that these religions were employed *pro tanto* in the counsels of Divine Providence, for purposes reaching beyond and above the consciousness of those who proclaimed and practised them.

Let us now proceed to take a somewhat higher flight. It will be admitted on all hands that the doctrine of a life beyond the grave is an article essential, to speak moderately, for the completeness of religion. Locke, in his famous Essay, excluded from toleration those who did not believe in a future state, because without such belief, as he held, they could give no sufficient guarantee for their conduct as good citizens.

---

[*] Isaiah xiv. 4–19.

[*] Hor. *Od.* b. iii. 1 ; v. 49.

[†] *Iliad*, x. 429.

[‡] Hom. *Od.* vii. 59, 206.

[§] *Ibid.* xi. 307.

[‖] G. Smith's *Assyrian Discoveries*, pp. 398–402.

[¶] Hor. *Od.* iii. iv. 60–4.

No one perhaps would act upon such an opinion now. There is a law written in our nature itself, apart both from temporal sanctions and from the prolongation of existence after death, which of itself imposes upon sound minds a real obligation to good conduct. But there are several things which may be fairly urged. First, all men have not sound minds; and secondly, that the doctrine of a future life not only harmonizes with, but very greatly strengthens that obligation. And moreover, that any power, which society now possesses to dispense with this powerful sanction, and yet enjoy comparative impunity, is largely due to an elevation in the social standard of right and wrong, both public and private, due to the long reign of Christianity in the manners, policy, and belief of civilized man.

We have seen that the doctrine of a future life was not among the sanctions of the Mosaic law. It is not necessary for my purpose to endeavor to track it through all the non-Mosaic religions of antiquity. It will be enough to dwell upon two of them, in which it appears to have attained, at a very early date, a remarkable development. And it is noteworthy that, while the recipients of special religious light in prehistoric times were Semites, neither of these cases is found among members of that family: the one being Aryan or Japhetic, and the other what is commonly called Turanian. They are respectively the cases of Iranians or Persians, and of Egypt. And there is a certain amount of resemblance between the two forms of development, which tends to favor the presumption of a common origin.

The "strain to faith," which Professor Cheyne regards as unsuited to an early stage in the existence of the race, seems to have been put upon the Egyptians and the Iranians at a very early stage indeed. Perhaps the case of Egypt carries us nearer to the fountainhead of historic time by its certified antiquity. But the date of Zarathustra, or, according to the Latin corruption of the name, Zoroaster, is thrown back by many beyond the reputed age even of the Egyptian remains. The modern Parsees bring him down to about 550 B.C.; but Drs. Haug and West point out that the movement, which he led, is noticed in the earlier Vedas, and conceive it not unreasonable to place him as a contemporary of Moses.

The great work of Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, published in 1837–41, made us familiar with the belief of the Egyptians, not only in a future life, but in a life of future retribution. Their funerals seem to have been celebrated with the utmost pomp of religious rites.[*] It is a well-known and at least plausible opinion, that the skilled preservation of the mummy was intended to conserve the remains in a condition fit for renewed occupation by their former owner. On the Monuments, a procession of boats cross, from Thebes, the Lake of the Dead, and at the necropolis the body is set up in the ancestral sepulchre. The final judgment is held before Osiris, no sinecurist like Aïdoneus in Homer, but the real working sovereign of the Underworld and its inhabitants; who governs as well as rules. Before him justice was administered, without the law's delay; administered there and then. The actions of the dead man were weighed in the scales of Truth, and recorded by Thoth.[†] Horos then conducted him into the presence of Osiris, Anubis also taking a share, and the four Genii of Amenti waiting to do their part. It was not dread of disgrace, says Wilkinson,[‡] which the Egyptians were taught to look upon as the principal inducement to virtue, but the fear of that final judgment, which awaited them in a future state, and which was to deal with their omissions as well as with their crimes. The all-scrutinizing eye of the Deity penetrated into the secrets of the heart; and, as the rewards of the good were beyond conception, so were the punishments of the bad, who were doomed to a transmigration into the forms of the most detested animals. The evidence of their belief is to be found amply recorded upon the oldest among their monuments.[§] In later times, the features of ritual and presentation were perhaps less strongly impressed upon the masses, but the tenet continued to be acknowledged by the Egyptians, and it seems sufficiently clear that from them the doctrine of immortality was learned by Pythagoras and Plato.[‖]

Let us now turn to the testimony, perhaps less remarkable, of the Zoroastrian religion. In the person of its great teacher, it was mainly based, says Haug, on Monotheism,[¶] although the *motor*, or evil principle, was present with that of good in Ahuramasda, or Ormuzd, himself.[**] He taught a future life which was to succeed the present one: nor did he hold survival only, but retribution, and likewise the resurrection of the body.[††] On the third night after death, the soul of the dead man approaches the bridge of Chinvat (or assembling), and is contended for by Deities on one side, and

---

[*] *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, by Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, Second Series, vol. iii. plates 83–8.

[†] Wilkinson, iii. ix.-xi. [‡] *Ibid.* ii. 438. [§] *Ibid.* i. 211.

[‖] Wilkinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, at ii. 123.

[¶] Haug, p. 301. [**] P. 303. [††] Pp. 217, 311-13.

Devas on the other, while he is examined by Ormuzd himself as to his conduct in the flesh. The pure soul passes the bridge, with a company of its fellows, and an escort of the blessed ones, into heaven.

> But the souls, which come to the bridge full of terror and sick, find no friend there: the evil spirits, Vizaresha by name, lead them bound down into the place of the dead; into the darkness, the dwelling of the Druj.[*]

Thus the Persian religion had a developed doctrine of immortality, like that of Egypt; though they were shut out by their rejection, in the early stages, of imagery and ritual from using those means of stamping it on the general mind, which were so freely employed by the Egyptians on their monuments. Nor can we doubt that the belief in immortality continued to hold its place in the authoritative standards of the religion, for we understand that it is cherished by the Parsees at the present day as a practical tenet. Whether it had not lapsed long ago from its position of influence may be doubtful. At any rate, a passage which we find in Herodotos seems to suggest a change of that character under the Achæmenid sovereigns of Persia. Cambyses, absent from his capital, had put to death his brother Smerdis. The murdered man was personated by an impostor, who proclaimed himself king, and sent a herald to make the proclamation in the camp. Cambyses at once challenged on the subject the person whom he had sent to commit the murder. This was Prexaspes, who replied by saying, "If the dead rise again, then indeed you may expect also to meet Astyages the Mede; but if things continue as they have been, you need have no anticipation of trouble from that quarter."[†]

Prexaspes spoke with the object of removing alarm from the mind of the king. This speech indicates a decline; and deterioration had also been manifested in other great articles of the religion of Zoroaster. First, it had been developed into an absolute dualism.[‡] Each of the two contending powers was surrounded with a council of six members, over which he simply presided, like a moderator in a presbytery. Under the sacerdotal and ritualistic system of the Magi, as Duncker[§] assures us, Ormuzd himself was represented as offering sacrifices to Mithra and others; actual images of the deities were fashioned under the first Artaxerxes;[*] and Artaxerxes II., falsifying the account of Herodotos,[†] erected a temple, as well as statues, to Anakita at Ecbatana.[‡]

To conclude. Both the conservation of the belief through so many centuries, and the immense force with which it seems to have acted on the public mind at the earliest epochs, stand in singular contrast, as to this great article, with the Mosaic system: nor do I see how we can refuse to recognize a sublime agency for the preservation of truth in the one case, as well as in the other. The God of revelation is the God of nature. The means employed may be different, but the aim is the same. And when the Redeemer, standing in Judea, brings life and immortality fully into light, He propounds a doctrine already not without venerable witness in the conscience and tradition of mankind.

DR. SCHÜRER ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.[§]

BY REV. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., DEAN IRELAND'S PROFESSOR OF EXEGESIS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, OXFORD, ENGLAND.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), October, 1891.

When the Editor kindly offered me the opportunity of replying to Dr. Schürer's article, it happened that I was already engaged upon it—not indeed directly, because I had not then seen the *Contemporary Review*, but in a form in which the greater part of the substance of it had previously appeared in Germany. Two years ago a little volume was published at Giessen[‖] containing two lectures, one of which was by Dr. Schürer on the "Present Position of the Johannean Question." Anything of Dr. Schürer's would at any time have attracted my attention, but this did so particularly, not only from the candor and fair-mindedness by which it was distinguished, but also from the fact that it anticipated a thought and purpose of my own. The leading idea which ran through it was the approach which the two sides in the critical controversy had of late been making toward each other; and I too had been struck by this, and had been hoping to take it in like manner as a starting-point in a survey of the critical situation. At the end of last term I announced for October a course of University lectures on this subject, which are likely afterward to appear in print. It may be thought, therefore, to be superfluous that I should offer these remarks in advance upon the paper, but several reasons have determined me to do so.

---

[*] Duncker, *History of Antiquity*, b. ii. ch. vii.: from the Vendidad.

[†] Herod. iii. 62, misquoted, as I conceive, by Duncker (vol. v. p. 181, Abbott's translation). The text runs: *εἰ μέν νυν οἱ τεθνεῶτες ἀνεστέασι . . . εἰ δ' ἔστι ὥσπερ πρὸ τοῦ, κ.τ.λ.* I note the tone and spirit, as well as the words.

[‡] Haug, p. 305.

[§] Book vii. ch. vii. Abbott's translation, p. 161 of vol. v.

[*] Book vii. ch. vii. Abbott's translation, p. 176 of vol. v.

[†] *Ibid.* p. 177.

[‡] Herod. i. 131.

[§] Dr. Schürer's article was reprinted in the previous number of this MAGAZINE.

[‖] "Vorträge der Theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen." V. Folge. Giessen, 1889.

In the first place, I must confess to being a little disappointed with the paper in its English dress. It does not seem to read so judicially as it did ; additions and alterations have been made in it, which have their value, but which seem to have given to it somewhat more of a cast of advocacy ; it is (or at least it appears) less sympathetic toward the conservative position, and one who adopts that position feels himself more put upon his defence. At the same time the *Contemporary Review* reaches a wide public, and one which is not likely to concern itself with what I may have to say elsewhere. But there are points in Dr. Schürer's article which I should be sorry to see pass unchallenged. And much as I think it marks a real advance on the critical side, and gladly as I welcome it as a step toward an ultimate understanding, I should be sorry for it to be thought that the position is exactly as it is described.

It will not, however, be expected that I should enter fully into the arguments by which Dr. Schürer supports his case. For that I must refer to the fuller statement which I am making elsewhere. It is not to be supposed that questions of this magnitude can be thrashed out in the pages of a magazine. I do not understand that Dr. Schürer himself is of that opinion ; but he has indicated with great clearness the broad lines of the controversy. He has taken I think a greater step than has yet been taken toward narrowing down its issues. And I cannot but think that it will be a still further gain if he is met frankly from the opposite camp, and if some one, who the present writer only wishes was rather more representative than himself, would say how far his proffered terms can be accepted. Dr. Schürer comes with an olive-branch, and I, too, would meet him with an olive-branch. A little mutual discussion may clear the ground for further parleys.

I fear that at the outset I cannot take to heart his comforting assurances that the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is not one which need affect the faith of a Christian. That faith rests upon what Jesus Christ really was, and not only upon what the Church has supposed Him to be. But the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is important chiefly from its bearing upon the character of the evidence as to what He was. So far as that evidence is imperfect or untrustworthy, our faith will rest upon insufficient grounds.

It is not, then, a question which can be entered upon with a light heart, or one in which merely academic or literary issues are involved. It is wholly different from the question as to whether there are one or two or more Isaiahs, or what may be the date of some of the Psalms :

> " Non levia aut ludicra petuntur
> Præmia, sed Fidei de vita et sanguine certant."

Of course it is a satisfaction to find that Dr. Schürer can surrender the Fourth Gospel without surrendering anything fundamental with it. I would not willingly place a stumbling-block in the way of those who are able to go with him. I am only afraid that I cannot count myself among the number. However, I do not say this with a view to evade the critical problem. On this ground at least Dr. Schürer and I are at one. I quite admit that a critical problem must be solved by critical methods—methods, that is, that are really critical ; and if our sense of the interests at stake makes us scrutinize those methods closely, and perhaps even jealously, this should be only a wholesome guarantee of soundness and care in their application. Far better to wait a while before a conclusion is reached, than reach it on hastily gathered and imperfectly tested data.

By no means the least valuable part of Dr. Schürer's essay is the historical sketch of the course of criticism. It was a happy thought to mark off the periods by the names of Bretschneider (1820), Baur (1844–1847), and Keim (1867). The characterization of each period is also, I think, skilfully given. The list of more recent opponents of the Gospel is, however, I suspect, less imposing than it looks. Of Thoma, Dr. Schürer has formed a sufficient estimate, though there are occasional good things among much extravagance. Pfleiderer will do his reputation no credit by the few pages which he has devoted to the Fourth Gospel in his "Urchristenthum" (pp. 776–786). But Pfleiderer the critic is a different person from Pfleiderer the historian of doctrine, and by no means entitled to the same consideration. Immer's "Neutest. Theologie" is quite a second-rate piece of work. Oscar Holtzmann disarms criticism by his modest preface. Perhaps it was this and his name which secured for him what I cannot but think a too complimentary notice in the "Theologische Literaturzeitung." Of a different calibre, no doubt, is his elder cousin, Dr. H. J. Holtzmann of Strassburg; but this most acute, widely read, and industrious scholar is addicted to hypercriticism. It is significant of his mental attitude that he has succeeded in convincing himself, and almost, as it would seem, succeeded in convincing Mangold as well, that the First Epistle which bears the name of St. John is not by the same author as the Gospel.* The most striking treatment of the Fourth Gospel with which I am acquainted on the negative side is that by Weizsäcker in his "Apostolisches Zeitalter" (1886). Here it comes in as part of a broadly planned constructive argument, which is developed in a masterly manner. I am stating in another quarter my own reasons for thinking that even the view thus presented of the Fourth Gospel is untenable.

I observe that the English version of Dr. Schürer's article has not been brought quite strictly down to date. No mention is made of a group of writings by Dr. Hugo Delff ("Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth," 1889; "Das vierte Evangelium," and "Neue Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung d. vierten Evangeliums," 1890), or of Dr. Paul Ewald's "Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage" (1890), or of Nösgen's "Geschichte d. neutest. Offenbarung" (1891). All these (with some qualification in the case of Dr. Delff) are on the same side, in favor of the Gospel; and in point of ability they will well bear comparison with their opponents. Dr. Delff is independent and original almost to a fault; but the theory which he puts forward, strange as it may seem, has rather more to be said for it than would appear at first sight. He believes that the Gospel has been interpolated (he would cut out the greater part of the prologue and the Galilæan sections), and he does not think that the Gospel was written by the son of Zebedee. But he does think that it was written by an eye-witness, whom he identifies with John, the Presbyter of Papias and Eusebius. He holds that this John was a native of Jerusalem and a member of one of the high-priestly families, taking quite literally and making much of the statement by Polycrates, that he wore the golden plate (πέταλον) of the high priest.† There are certain points about the Gospel of which Dr. Delff has laid a vigorous hold; one is its essentially Jewish character, and the extent to which its statements may be illustrated out of the Talmud; and the other is the insight which the author shows into the temper and aims of the upper classes in Jerusalem. His book is full of shrewd remarks, it is fair to add, cutting both ways, for he is a perfectly free lance in criticism. I need hardly say that I do not think that the interpolation theory will stand; but the book is one which will have to be reckoned with. Dr. Paul Ewald is another wielder of a vigorous pen, and a staunch defender of the Gospel as it stands. He does not treat the whole subject, but he has, I think, shown reason to believe that the characteristic ideas of the Fourth Gospel had a wider diffusion in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic ages than they had been supposed to have, and that it is not legitimate to follow the Synoptic type merely to the exclusion of them. After all, that type represents, not the general consciousness of the Church, but the particular tradition embodied in the two leading documents, the Mark Gospel and the Matthæan Logia. Again, I do not think that all Dr. P. Ewald's materials will hold good; but there is a sufficient residuum to establish his point, and this, too, will have to be reckoned with. Nösgen represents a more old-fashioned and stricter conservatism. I cannot say that I find his close-packed volume easy or attractive reading; but it deserves the recognition which is due to painstaking and conscientious work.

In regard to our English criticism, Dr. Schürer, I think, has been a little misled in supposing that the discussion of external evidence so much preponderates over that of internal. So far as it may seem to do so, this is due to the impulse given to that side of the controversy by the work entitled "Supernatural Religion." If Dr. Schürer will take up any of the recent commentaries on the Gospel, especially those by Dr. Westcott and Dr. H. R. Reynolds, or the "Introduction" by Dr. Salmon, he will see that the external evidence has no larger place than is its due.*

Twenty years ago, in a youthful work of my own, I excused myself for treating only of the internal evidence on grounds very similar to those alleged by Dr. Schürer.

> "The subject of the external evidence has been pretty well fought out. The opposing parties are probably as near to an agreement as they are likely to be. It will hardly be an unfair statement of

---

* "Jahrb. f. prot. Theol." 1882, p. 128 ff.; Bleek-Mangold, "Einleitung," p. 769.

† Eus. H. E. iii. 31, 3.

* Dr. Westcott gives to it about 4¼ pages of his "Prolegomena," which extend in all to 97; Dr. Reynolds assigns to it 25 pages out of 161; Dr. Salmon treats the whole group of Johannean writings together, and his discussion of the external evidence is less easy to separate, but he goes thoroughly into the internal evidence, and the same might be said of Dr. Plummer and Archdeacon Watkins.

> the case for those who reject the Johannean authorship of the Gospel to say that the external evidence is compatible with that supposition; and on the other hand we may equally say for those who accept the Johannean authorship that the external evidence would not be sufficient alone to prove it."[*]

When this was written I do not think that I was prepared for quite so great an extension of the evidence as has since taken place. I am at present disposed to rate the argument from external evidence rather higher. Of course "prove" is a large word, and it would certainly be too much to say that the genuineness of the Gospel was "proved" by the external evidence. Still, I believe that it is distinctly favorable to the genuineness. Several points I am willing to concede to Dr. Schürer in the summary which he has added to the English version of his paper. (1) I think that English criticism has taken too little account of the so-called Alogi. Not that their dissent is of much real importance; it appears to have been based upon doctrinal or critical and not upon historical grounds, and it does not at all imply the existence of a continuous tradition adverse to the Gospel. Still, it is an exception to the general *consensus*, and so far forth it shows that toward the end of the third quarter of the second century the Canon of the Gospels had not reached the same degree of fixedness in some localities that it had in others. (2) I attach but little weight to the now unequivocal testimony of the Clementine Homilies, because of the uncertainty of their date. It was the Tübingen critics who laid stress upon them first, and the same stress has continued to be laid upon them longer than was necessary. (3) But, on the other hand, the recovery of the "Diatessaron" is a fact of real importance. Tatian's "Diatessaron" and Heracleon's "Commentary" together are significant of the estimate in which the Gospel was held between Justin and Irenæus, and are more than a valid set-off against the Alogi. There is really a very strong phalanx of testimony from this period. (4) I take note of Dr. Schürer's admission, which is no more than right, in regard to Justin; but I think that it is too readily assumed that the fewer allusions to this Gospel are due to any doubt as to its authority. Tatian alone would be presumptive evidence against any such doubt. But how many other causes might account for this slighter notice! Justin's Christianity can hardly have been of many years' standing when he wrote. The Gospels probably did not all reach him at once; he would use most those which came to him first and pre-occupied his memory. At least one great Johannean conception—that of the Logos—exercised a very considerable influence over him. But Justin not only had the Gospel; he had it, I suspect, with more than one marked corruption already in its text (John i. 13, iii. 3, 5, and possibly ix. 1[*]), proving that it was no newly circulated work. More of this elsewhere. (4) I am surprised to see Dr. Schürer repeat an argument which has so often been exploded as that about Papias. I would commend to him the decisive discussion of it in Bishop Lightfoot's "Essays on Supernatural Religion." It would be much truer to say that the evidence of Papias and Polycarp to the First Epistle is evidence also to the Gospel. And Bishop Lightfoot[†] gave a reason, which is not without some weight, for believing that Papias had a knowledge of the Gospel. (5) The tendency in England among very dispassionate theologians is to think that Basilides himself, and not merely his disciples, used the Gospel. So (inferentially) Dr. Hort;[‡] so a paper recently read in Oxford by Dr. James Drummond; and so, too, the great American scholar, Dr. Ezra Abbot. I may add that Staehlin's theory about the Hippolytean account of Basilides, though suggested from this side the water, is finding but little favor among us. But if Basilides accepted the Gospel, where is the probability that it was composed in the second century?

On all these grounds I think that there is a clear balance of testimony in favor of the Gospel which cannot be put aside as if it did not exist. The composition of the Gospel is pushed back to a time very near that of the Apostle, and even the modified date (130 A.D.), which Dr. Schürer now believes to be the "latest" (p. 394), cannot, I think, be maintained.

But I am willing to allow that the main battle must be fought out on the internal evidence.

And here I am afraid that Dr. Schürer will think me rather grasping, for I must take all, or nearly all, the concessions which he gives me, and (with one exception) I have but little to offer him in return.

That he should make these concessions speaks well for his disinterestedness and openness of mind. But they are such as must certainly be made, and that in still fuller measure, for truth cannot always lie hid, and it will assert itself in the long run.

---

[*] "Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel," p. 8. London, 1872.

[*] *Cf.* Resch, "Agrapha," p. 23 f.

[†] "Essays," p. 193 (see also pp. 32 ff., 184 ff.).

[‡] "Dictionary of Christian Biography," i. 271.

The one point which Dr. Schürer seems disposed to give, and which I hesitate in accepting, is as to the day of the Crucifixion. Dr. Schürer sums up here very fairly and well. He quite sees that there is a case, and a strong case, on both sides. There is much to be said both for the Synoptic date (Nisan 15) on the one hand, and for St. John's date (apparently Nisan 14) on the other. Dr. Schürer admits that the evidence is evenly balanced, but thinks that "it must be distinctly granted that the Johannine narrative is internally the most probable." Twenty years ago I took very much this view myself. I was content to allow the Johannean version simply to override the other. To-day I am not so sure that the two narratives cannot be reconciled; and if they are reconciled I think that it must be on the basis of the Synoptic version, not the Johannean.

Let me not be misunderstood on this point. I do not wish for any wresting of either narrative simply in the interests of a harmony. I am not concerned to prove that either St. John or the Synoptics are free from error. If there is a real collision, so let it be. But in everyday life, when two alternatives are put before us—both strongly supported, and yet, as it seems, mutually excluding each other—the conclusion to which we come naturally would be that there was somewhere behind the scenes some unknown factor which would reconcile them, if we only knew it.

In the present instance the question is one which must be ultimately decided by specialists in Jewish antiquities. The crucial points, as it seems to me, are two. Schürer adduces evidence to show that no courts could be held and no business transacted on the first day of the Paschal feast. But all the passages cited relate, not to a feast-day, but to the Sabbath, and therefore depend for their force upon the assumption that feast-day and Sabbath were precisely on the same footing. But it seems to me that Nösgen is right in calling this in question.[*] The other point is, whether the phrase "eat the Passover" may refer to the eating of the *Chagigah*, and not to that of the Paschal Lamb. I have in my mind Schürer's own monograph on the subject ("Ueber φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα, Giessen, 1883). But a higher authority still on such a subject pronounces against him. Dr. Edersheim concludes a note written directly in view of Schürer's argument: "No competent Jewish archæologist would care to deny that 'Pesach' may refer to the 'Chagigah,' while the motive assigned to the Sanhedrists by St. John implies that in this instance it must refer to this, and not to the Paschal Lamb."[*] I am prepared to think, therefore, until better advised, that the narrative in St. John need not conflict with that in the Synoptics.

On the other points on which St. John either adds to or seems to correct the Synoptic narrative I have never had the slightest doubt, and I am glad that Dr. Schürer recognizes the excellence of the Johannean tradition. The qualification which he adds surely may be struck out. In a few expressions here and there, and possibly in portions of the narrative, the Fourth Gospel appears to be dependent on the Synoptics. I agree that this is the most probable explanation of coincidences like the two hundred *denarii* worth of bread (John vi. 7; Mark vi. 37), or the myrrh that might be sold for three hundred *denarii* (John xii. 5; Mark xiv. 5). It is not exactly a case of "borrowing," but the writer had seen the works of his predecessors, and his memory was quickened by what he read there. I do not think that he wrote with his predecessor's words actually before him; but if he had done so, and if he had copied them far more extensively than he has, I cannot understand how Dr. Schürer could write that "literary dependence on the Synoptics is very strange for an Apostle." There was a stage when such an argument might have been used, but that I should have thought was far past. Surely "literary dependence" of one writer upon another—great or small—is one of the very commonest phenomena all through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation.

It is a different matter when we come to the supposed want of progressiveness in St. John's presentation of the Messianic claim. Here there is a real ground for Dr. Schürer's objections, and he has stated them with much force. And yet he has not, I think, escaped the danger of writing as an advocate rather than as a judge. If he were writing as a judge, a good many facts would come into view which he has ignored, and his estimate of some of those which he has given would have been somewhat different.

---

[*] "Gesch. d. neutest. Offenb." i 579. The reference to Knobel-Dillmann on Ex. xii. 16 runs as follows: "Die Geschäftsruhe braucht keine gänzliche zu sein; es darf gemacht werden, *was gegessen wird von jeglicher Seele*, d. h. die Speisen dürfen bereitet werden welche die Personen brauchen. Am Sabbath und Versöhnungstag war jedes Geschäft verboten, auch Feueranmachen, Kochen und Backen, an den andern Festtagen blos jedes Arbeitsgeschäft."

[*] "Life and Times," &c. ii. 568 (fourth edition). See also the preceding note, p. 566 f.

I will, however, meet him at the outset by saying that I am prepared to make one large concession—that concession which, as he rightly says, marks the chief advance that conservative critics have now in very many instances made toward their opponents. I make it not merely from a wish to conciliate them, or to rescue the genuineness of the Gospel, but in the interests of what I conceive to be historically probable and true. In this respect I have no change to make from the position which I took up twenty years ago. To say that the Gospel was written by St. John is not to say that it is necessarily in all points an exact representation of the facts. It was written by the Apostle toward the end of a long life. But what should we expect under such circumstances? When an old man looks back over the past, one of the first things which he is apt to lose is the sense of perspective. End and beginning draw nearer together. The facts which belong to an earlier stage of development are seen in the light which is thrown upon them by a later stage, and this later interpretation affects the statement of them as history. I admit that St. John's narrative may have been influenced in this way. I am not prepared to say exactly how far it has been influenced, but some such influence seems to me to be in the nature of the case.

I cannot, however, allow that the narrative is by any means so unprogressive as it has been made out to be. Even Dr. Schürer does not seem to be able to get rid of our modern associations. Because we attach to the name "Messiah" a fully developed Christology, he seems to suppose that it must have attached to it from the first. It is true that Jesus of Nazareth is recognized as the Messiah by the first disciples who join Him. But what of that? There were a score Messiahs between the death of Herod and the fall of Jerusalem. Large sections of the people were keenly expectant of the Coming One, and were ready enough on slight evidence to greet and acknowledge Him. But these first hasty and vague recognitions were very different from the deliberate confession of St. Peter, when it was clear already that the common idea of the Messiah was not that which Jesus Himself entertained, or which He came to satisfy. The blessing which St. Peter called down upon himself was the blessing of those who saw this—saw at least something of this—and yet believed: "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in Me!"

It was this test which perhaps we need not say proved too much for the Baptist, but seemed at a time of great and natural depression as if it might prove too much for him. There is not the smallest contradiction between the misgivings which arise in the Baptist's mind in his dungeon at Machaerus, and that high inspiration (as much above his ordinary level as the doubt was below it) with which he saluted Jesus when He came to his baptism. I am surprised that Dr. Schürer should acquiesce in such a shallow view of history as to suppose that there was any such contradiction, and that the question of St. John must needs be that of "one in whom the spark of faith is beginning to glimmer for the first time!" Our German friends have one fault: they are apt to think of men and women as if they were machines which have but one motion, and not creatures of flesh and blood, now obeying this impulse and now that.

I am surprised, too, at Dr. Schürer's next paragraph, which I feel sure that he would not have written in the "Theologische Literaturzeitung," or anywhere in which it appealed to a trained, and not to a popular audience. The expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the Temple is put forward as an act implying the highest prerogatives of the Messiah. Why so? It is precisely on the same footing with many of the acts of the Old Testament prophets; it might have been performed by Isaiah or Jeremiah, or Micaiah the son of Imlah, and very possibly would have been performed by them if they had had to deal with the same state of things.

When we look at all beneath the surface of the Johannean narrative there are many signs of the same reserve which we find in the Synoptics. After the feeding of the 5000 the crowds cannot restrain their enthusiasm; they try to take Jesus by force and make Him king (vi. 15); but He retires out of their way. A little later we find Him still in Galilee, and His brothers half-ironically urge Him to go up into Judæa: "For no man doeth anything in secret, and himself seeketh to be known openly. If Thou doest these things, manifest Thyself to the world" (vii. 4). This is hardly consistent with a public and continuous proclamation of Messiahship. This state of things still lasts as late as the winter before the Passion. At the Feast of Dedication (*i.e.*, in December) we are told that the Jews came about Jesus and said to Him, "How long dost Thou hold us in suspense? If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly"

(x. 24). Clearly He had *not* hitherto told them "plainly;" He had not made any distinct and explicit declaration of His Messiahship. I would venture to lay stress on this passage. It is the Johannean counterpart to the message of the Baptist, and reveals a consciousness on the part of the writer of the true state of things. It also agrees with the confused and whispered questionings of chapter vii., where individuals are still groping their way toward an assured belief; they have a suspicion that the Messiah is among them, and apply all the tests they know to ascertain the fact; but there does not appear to be any clear and direct issue, involving a Yes or No, set before them.

Whether all this is equally consistent with the discourses recorded in the previous chapters is more than I should like to say. We are apt to read into them more than would be read into them at the time. But I suspect that the Evangelist himself also made them more explicit in the announcement of Divinity. I have said already that I would not vouch for the literal accuracy of these discourses. Yet no valid argument can be drawn from that against their Apostolic authorship. It is just what must have happened unless the laws which regulate the processes of the human mind were suspended. The *foundation* of the discourses I fully believe to be genuine. There is nothing in them which is really inconsistent with what we know from other sources of the teaching of Jesus. For the proof that this is so I may appeal to a writer to whom Dr. Schürer will listen with respect. Dr. H. H. Wendt, in the recent volume of his "Lehre Jesu," after a most elaborate comparison of Johannean doctrine with that of the Synoptics, ends by drawing up a series of propositions, all of which he contends are fully confirmed from them. I would not of course pledge myself to every detail in Wendt's position; I do not believe in his theory of interpolations. I agree both with him and with Dr. Schürer that certain points are selected by the Evangelist for special emphasis which would not bulk so large in the actual teaching of Jesus; and also that there may be very possibly an element of *anticipation in time,* truths being put forward in the Gospel at an earlier date than that to which they really belonged. I agree also that there has been some recasting in the form of the discourses. But this is the furthest point to which I can go. And I see in all these points an argument for rather than against the view that the Gospel was written by St. John. A lesser man, a man with faith less deep, a man less thoroughly imbued with the mind of Christ, would have been more timorous in his handling. The Evangelist writes from a serene height of full assurance and personal conviction, which it seems to me easiest to attribute to an Apostle of the Lord.

But are there other reasons for regarding the Gospel as the work of an Apostle? There are really overwhelming reasons, which may be seen amply stated by our English authors—Westcott, Salmon, Watkins, Plummer, Reynolds, Gloag; or by Continental scholars, such as Luthardt, Godet, Weiss, Beyschlag, Nösgen, Bleek, and a number of others. It is, I cannot but think, nothing less than morally certain that the author of the Gospel was a Jew of Palestine, and also in a high degree probable that he was a contemporary and eye-witness of the events which he records. The first proposition is proved by his intimate knowledge of Jewish topography, manners and customs, and modes of thought. It would be wearisome to repeat the lists of instances which have been accumulated in such profusion; but it should be enough to take up a work like Lightfoot's "Horæ Hebraicæ," or Wünsche's "Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Misrasch," or to study the notes in Dr. Edersheim's "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," to see how thoroughly at home the Evangelist is on Jewish soil. For the second proposition appeal may be made primarily to the life-like presentation of the way in which Christianity gradually detaches itself from Judaism, the gradual testing and acceptance or rejection of the Messianic claims, with the impression which they made upon different classes and sections of the people—a picture of singular variety and delicacy; and appeal may be made secondarily to the clearness, precision, firmness of stroke, or generally graphic effect in the delineation of scenes and characters.* This last point no doubt admits of a twofold explanation. It may be due to direct contact with the facts, or it may be due to a strong dramatic imagination. The second century does not furnish much encouragement to the latter hypothesis; but it may be allowed that genius sometimes overleaps the conditions of time and place, and therefore we will not press the argument unduly. However this may be, no genius, we contend, would have treated the collision between Judaism and nascent Christianity as the Evangelist has dealt with it; and we securely rest upon that for proof that no middle link intervenes between the facts and their narrator.

---

* Let me suggest to the reader to go through for himself such passages as i. 19–28; vii. 11–15, 25–27, 40–52; x. 19–24; xi. 54–57. Let him ask himself in particular if such questions as those in i. 25; iv. 9; vi. 30–31; vii. 15, 27, 48–49; viii. 48; ix. 2; x. 21, would have occurred to a Christian writer in the second century.

I regret to see that the two propositions I have mentioned are still disputed by Dr. Schürer. At the same time I note with pleasure his admission that the old supposed catalogue of errors in matters Palestinian is no longer tenable. Keim set the example in treating this part of the subject with candor,[*] and Dr. Schürer has gone yet further in the path of reasonable criticism. Yet even he leaves one solitary instance still standing, though he allows that it is "not decisive" (!)—the old, well-worn argument that the Evangelist, by speaking of Caiaphas as "high priest of that year" (xi. 49, 51), implied a yearly tenure of the high priesthood.[†] When we consider how impressed the Evangelist is with the momentous issues of the crisis he is describing, how fond he is of emphasis, and of this particular word ἐκεῖνος for conveying emphasis, and the further fact that about the time in question high priests were repeatedly set up and deposed by the Romans (for instance, the three immediate predecessors of Caiaphas in as many years), it would surely be no great straining of the critical conscience not to allow this one most doubtful objection to weigh against the ninety-and-nine good and sound examples of direct acquaintance of the Evangelist with the circumstantial setting of his narrative.

More noteworthy altogether than anything I can remember to have seen in German are the arguments on this head of an English clergyman, the Rev. J. A. Cross, vicar of Little Holbeck, Leeds.[‡] These are, however, of different degrees of value, and I hope to examine them at some length in another place.

The last stronghold into which Dr. Schürer retires has two bulwarks—(1) the opposition of the Gospel to Judaism, and (2) the Greek philosophical training of the author.

In regard to (1) Dr. Schürer surely draws large inferences from the simple mention of St. John along with St. Peter and St. James in Gal. ii. 9. The truth is, that we know absolutely nothing of the mental process by which St. John followed the general movement of the Church toward catholicity, except what we learn from the Gospel (on the supposition that it is genuine). Where the teaching of facts had been so decisive—and in the destruction of Jerusalem, written, as it were, by the hand of heaven itself—it surely is not strange that one who was possessed of such profound ideas as to the working of God in history should have accepted unreservedly a conclusion which fitted in so well with the rest of his thinking. And yet we need not go all the lengths with Franke to hold that the Gospel has its roots very really in the Old Testament, and that the development which it discloses is an extremely gentle and gradual development, marked by no violent breaks or convulsions, but a steady, continuous growth from first to last. And we may hold, too (with Wendt[*]), that the attitude of the Evangelist to the Old Testament is essentially that of the Apostolic age, and not that of the period which followed; "that it is not like that of the Rabbis or of Philo; not like that of St. Paul, or of the Gnostics, or any other post-Apostolic estimate; but that it has its analogy only in the attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament, as attested by St. Mark and by the Logia." When we add to this natural inward growth from definite evangelical premisses an outward removal in time and place from the centre of Judaism, with something of an original sense of antagonism between the spirit of Galilee and of Jerusalem, and between the disciples of Jesus and His persecutors and murderers, it seems to me that all the phenomena receive a satisfactory explanation. On the other hand, the negative theory which is advocated by Dr. Schürer gives by no means a satisfactory account of the fundamental rooting of the Gospel in Old Testament ideas.

This fundamental rooting is, I take it, really a far more important fact than any contact which the Gospel shows with Greek—*i.e.*, with Alexandrian—philosophy. When I first wrote on the Fourth Gospel I accepted what was then the predominant view, that the prologue to the Gospel at least did point to such contact and connection. If I am now inclined to think differently, I hope that I can honestly say that it is not from apologetic motives, but in deference to what I conceive to be a better and truer view of the facts. With the example of St. Paul before us, and the extraordinarily rapid growth which he underwent in a very short space of time, we could not think it strange if a nature no less receptive showed traces of Hellenistic influence after from twenty to thirty years of residence in a Greek city. But, as at present advised, I am disposed to reduce those traces to a minimum. On this point I should have to join issue directly with Dr. Schürer. I confess that by none of his previous writings was I prepared for the language which he uses in his article, which seems to me to be strangely wrong and beside the mark. "The Logos doctrine is not the only point of contact between the Fourth Gospel and the Græco-Jewish philosophy. The whole world of the Evangelist's thought is much more Hellenistic than (Old Testament) Jewish. The prominent intellectual characteristic which distinguishes him comes from the Greek sphere of education. The essence of salvation consists in the knowledge of the truth ; through it freedom is attained. Redemption is therefore effected through enlightenment. So Jesus is the Redeemer, because He brought His revelation" (p. 44). I will confront Dr. Schürer here with another, to whose words he will attach more weight than he will to mine—his former colleague as professor, and his present colleague as editor—Dr. Harnack. I quote from the second edition of the "Dogmengeschichte," which is less favorable for my purpose than the first :—

---

[*] "Jesu von Nazara," i. 133.

[†] The two Holtzmanns have improved upon this by contending that the notion is borrowed from the Asiatic ἀρχιερεις (H. Holtzm., "Einl.," p. 469, second edition; O. Holtzm., "Joh.-Ev." p 115).

[‡] *Westminster Review*, August 1890, pp. 172-182; *Critical Review*, Feb. 1891, pp. 152-158; *Classical Review*, 1890, p. 453 f., 1891, p. 142 f. (cf. p. 245 ff.).

[*] "Lehre Jesu," ii. 356.

> "It is not Greek *theologumena* which have been at work in the Johannean theology. Even the Logos *has little in common with Philo's but the name*, and its mention at the beginning of the Book is an enigma, and not the solution of one—but out of the ancient faith of the Prophets and Psalmists the testimony of the Apostles to Christ wrought a new faith in one who lived among Greeks with disciples of Jesus. For this very reason the author must undoubtedly, and in spite of his sharp opposition to Judaism, be held to be a born Jew." *

There are points in this with which I cannot agree, but it is at least far nearer the truth than what has just been quoted from Dr. Schürer. The interpretation of the prologue to the Gospel by the latter seems to me to rest on a radically wrong exegesis. If the author had meant what Dr. Schürer makes him mean, he would certainly be treading in the footsteps of Philo ; but an intellectualism has been imported into his language which is wholly foreign to it. The "enlightenment" of which the prologue speaks is of the character and will, and only in a very subordinate sense of the intellect ; and the revelation of God is also the revelation of His will and character, and has nothing to do with metaphysical speculation.

The same error runs through the note in which Dr. Schürer speaks of the doctrine of the Logos (p. 407) :

> "The Greek expression 'Logos' (John i. 1) is translated in Western versions of the Bible by 'Word.' It might just as well be translated 'Reason' (Vernunft), for the Greek expression signifies both, and the notion which lies at the basis of the conception of Logos allows of both modes of translation. The starting-point of the Logos is not simply the thought that God works by His word, His speaking (Gen. i.), but that He works through His reason, His wisdom (Prov. viii. ix.)."

Dr. Westcott lays down at the beginning of his comment upon the same passage that "the term λόγος never has the sense of *reason* in the New Testament ;" and the only way in which Dr. Schürer could make good his assertion to the contrary would be by cutting off the prologue from all connection with the Gospel.

I am speaking elsewhere of what seem to me further erroneous assumptions of Dr. Schürer's—in particular of his denial * (which is not repeated in the article before me) of a connection between the Johannean Logos and the *Memra* of the Targums ; but enough will have been said for him to understand where a clear line of separation still lies between us. I believe that I should have with me the great body of defenders of the Gospel in England. We have each learned from the other. At least I confess that I have modified several of the views with which I started quite as much from external teaching as from any growth of knowledge or reflection. The only point on which I suspect that we should be somewhat divided would be as to the extent to which there has been a recasting of form in the Johannean discourses.† I suppose that I should go as far as any one to meet Dr. Schürer in this respect. But I do not see any reason to think that this recasting has been carried beyond the point which would be, I do not say permissible, but natural and probable, in an Apostle.

We, here in England, are perhaps somewhat averse to abstract thinking, but we are attracted all the more by what seem to us touches of nature and the play of actual human life. And as well as we can realize the historical situation in the Gospel, there is so much in it which corresponds, and corresponds so forcibly, with what must have been the reality of Christ's surroundings, that we find it impossible to detach the author from implication in them.

---

* "Dogmengeschichte," i. 85 (2nd ed.).

* "Theol. Literaturzeitung," 1886, col. 5.

† Allowance should also be made for some difference of opinion on the extent of Philonian influence.

I am aware that there is a tendency in Germany, dating, I imagine, from Weizsäcker's "Apostolisches Zeitalter," to find a solution for the problem of the Gospel by referring it to a disciple of the aged Apostle, who made use of the tradition derived from him after he was gone. This is the view which is implied in the passage quoted above from the second edition of Harnack's "Dogmengeschichte" (in the first edition the Gospel was treated as the work of St. John himself), and the same view is hinted at in the German original of Dr. Schürer's paper. It has no doubt at first sight the attractiveness of a compromise. It is, I think, less untenable than the view which denies all association of the Apostle with the Gospel; but I cannot think that any more than that it will hold its own in the end. The characteristic features of the Gospel *are not such as any tradition would have preserved which was not committed to writing.* But the moment we allow that any part of the Gospel was actually written by the Apostle we cannot stop short of assigning the main body of it to him. I must reserve to another occasion some fuller remarks on this point. But in the meantime I would invite any one who was interested in the subject simply to study the passages to which reference was made above (p. 539 *n.*), and they are only a sample of a number of others, and to let them have their rightful weight with him. It is not enough to do as Dr. Schürer does, merely to abandon certain negative arguments and waive certain objections which have been taken to the positive arguments. Those arguments must be allowed to tell in all their force and volume; and if that is done I cannot think that they will be held to be satisfied by a conclusion such as Dr. Schürer's.

PAINTER AND PREACHER.

BY JAMES STALKER, D.D.

From *Good Words* (London), October, 1891.

THERE is a real philosophical ground behind the comparison of the painter and the preacher. It is the connection between religion and art. This connection is a very prominent historical fact. Religion and art have been wedded on a grand scale, especially in the Roman communion; and art has achieved its greatest triumphs in the service of religion.

But this connection may have been accidental; and Protestants cannot allow that it has been wholly legitimate. Are the things themselves, then, connected in their own nature? They are very closely connected. Religion has to deal with God, and art has to deal with beauty; but may not God and beauty be at bottom different names for the same object, which we call God when it addresses us on the ethical, and beauty when it addresses us on the æsthetical side of our nature?

At least the resemblances between God and beauty are numerous and important.

Beauty inheres in everything—in land and sea, in earth and sky, in plants and animals; in man's soul and in his actions; in the history of the world. Wherever we turn in this system of things wherein we dwell, it looks out on us from every object on which the inner or the outer eye can rest. It is a subtle something, a universally diffused light, immeasurable, elusive, but swelling and breaking softly on every shore of the universe. In it we live, and move, and have our being.

And in man there is something to which beauty appeals: he is a beauty-appreciating being. He was made for it, and rises nearer to his own ideal the more it enters into him. It is, however, a mere philosophical figment to say that it is he who creates it. Where would it be, the idealist asks, if there was no eye to see it? Does it not first come into existence when the brute-mass of the universe assumes form and order in a thinking mind? But this is only an intellectual juggle. Beauty exists out there, whether we perceive it or not—an all-pervading essence, enswathing the whole round of nature.

How like this is to a description of God! He also is everywhere—in nature, in human nature, and in history. There is not a leaf or a blade of grass in which God is not pulsing. Behind the purple streaks of sunrise and the rolling masses of sunset He is hidden, as a figure is within its flowing robes. He is in every just thought of the thinking mind. He is in the rise and fall of empires and the revolutions of peoples. It is the greatest of all heresies to banish Him to the outside of the universe, and make Him a mechanician keeping it going from the outside. "He is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live, and move, and have our being."

On the other hand, there is in man that to which this Presence, which fills every object in the universe around him, appeals: man is a God-perceiving being. He is destined to know God, and his own development is measured by the degree in which he attains to this knowledge. There is, indeed, a certain kind of philosophy which, when it speaks of man as a religious being, intends only to assert that he has certain organic instincts which project out upon the screen of the universe a vast figure, to which the name of God is given, but to which there is nothing corresponding in the nature of things. This, however, is an unworthy account of the facts of life. As well might it be said that the universal perception of beauty is a mere projection of the figments of the mind upon the screen of nature, in which there exists in reality no beauty at all. In man everywhere religion appears, and its outline is the more distinct the more he rises in the scale of development. The only fair interpretation of this fact is that the universe by which he is surrounded is full of a somewhat—innumerable facts suggests that it is a Someone—ceaselessly making impressions on him, of which religion is the result.

Man is thus a beauty-perceiving and a God-perceiving being. But, although he lives surrounded by beauty and by God, it does not follow that he perceives either of them immediately or fully. In fact, the average man is extremely blind to both; and the power of perceiving either is a slow and gradual acquisition.

Here comes in the function of the artist and the preacher. The artist is the interpreter of beauty to his fellow-creatures, and the preacher is the interpreter of God. The great majority of men require to have both God and beauty pointed out to them in the different regions of the universe and the different aspects of life, before they perceive them; although, after they have seen them once, they have the power of repeating the perception, and even of transmitting it as a hereditary attainment.

In reference to beauty, Robert Browning, one of the profoundest speculators on art who have ever appeared, has expressed this truth in the well-known lines,

> "We're made so that we love
> First when we see them painted things we've passed
> Perhaps a hundred times, nor cared to see."

Every one will recognize the justice of this subtle remark in regard to single objects; but it is equally true of classes of objects, and of whole sides of the universe. The power of perceiving the beauty of the world, which is now the universal possession of the educated, has been a very gradual acquisition, some of the steps of which can be distinctly traced. For instance, the appreciation of the beautiful in landscape is held by first-class authorities to be a comparatively recent acquisition, not dating back much more than a hundred years. I have seen it alleged against Calvin that, although he passed his days in one of the loveliest spots on earth, there is not a line in all his works to show that he had ever looked with any emotion on the Lake of Geneva at his feet, or the glow of sunset on the distant Alps. But this is an ignorant charge; because at that time this was a general defect even of the cultivated, the power of appreciating landscape not being yet developed. The rise of the appreciation of beauty can be traced in the same way in other sections of nature. Thousands of ploughmen have driven their share through the habitation of the "wee, cowerin', timorous" mouse, and crushed the daisy "'mang the weet;" but it is only since the eye of Robert Burns discerned the beauty and pathos of these incidents that they have become beautiful and pathetic to every mind.

Here, then, we see the function of the artists: they are the interpreters of the beauty of the world. They live for it; they are on the watch for it; they discover it in this and that; to a few of the greatest of them it is given to descry it in some large department of nature where it has not been perceived before; and, having learned to see it themselves, they teach mankind to see it.

Precisely similar is the function of the preacher; but it is God, instead of beauty, that he has to see, and help others to see. The savage has sometimes been represented as standing awe-struck in the midst of the universe, out of which he felt God to be looking on him with a million eyes. But the very opposite is the truth. To the savage the world is bare and commonplace, and the power of seeing God in it is a laborious acquisition. Convictions about the existence and nature of God, which are now so wrought into the very texture of the human mind as to appear to be part of its original endowment, have been a slow acquisition from the region of nescience. One here and there perceived God in this thing and that; to some of the greatest minds it was given to see Him on new sides of the universe; to the prophets of one favored nation it pleased Him to give a special revelation of Himself; those who had seen Him for themselves taught others to see Him; and gradually the new power became the possession of humanity at large.

From these principles it would be easy to derive rules for the behavior of the painter and the preacher in the practice of their callings.

The most fundamental one is this : that the painter must really see beauty, must live in it and enthusiastically love it ; and the preacher must really see God, his one enthusiasm being to see Him with greater clearness and in new regions, and to make others see Him.

The call to follow the artistic life consists in the possession of the gift of seeing beauty. Unless a man sees it more fully than the multitude, to seek artistic fame can be for him only a diseased ambition ; and the station and degree which any one takes among artists must be determined by the extent of his faculty for beauty. It is a question how far this faculty is a power which can be acquired. The general belief appears to be that it is a natural gift, for presence of which no reason can be assigned, except that it has pleased nature to bestow it. We, therefore, call it artistic genius.

Is there a corresponding genius for perceiving God, which is conferred only on exceptional individuals, and of which no account can be given, except that it has pleased the Author of human nature to bestow it ? In the most orthodox systems of theology, the account given of the power of seeing God approximates closely to this, the definition of grace coinciding in many particulars with the definition of genius. And to the language of orthodoxy at this point that of some of the most unorthodox thinkers has had a singular resemblance. Goethe, for example, believed the faculty of religion to be a gift bestowed only on exceptional individuals, and he did not think that it had been bestowed on himself. There is, indeed, this great difference, that, while the gift of genius is in all cases congenital, the gift of grace may supervene at any stage of life ; and probably the safest and truest view is that no human being is inaccessible to it ; but the question whether or not he shall be the possessor of it depends on his own behavior toward Divine influences which are common to all.

It may still, however, be a legitimate inquiry, whether for the true teacher of religion something that deserves to be called a genius for religion be not necessary. While all men have probably in some degree the power of perceiving the beauty of the world, we justify a man for adopting the profession of an artist only if he possesses this faculty in a degree which amounts to genius. Does not the preacher require a similar justification ? Ought he not to be a man who, if religion did not exist, could create it from the vividness of his own impressions of God ?

At all events the actual vision of beauty and of God alone makes the artist and the preacher. Conventionalism is the bane of art. It comes into existence as soon as artists, instead of maintaining a living converse with the spirit of beauty in the world, rely on the perceptions of their predecessors, painting trees, animals and men, not from their own impressions of these objects, but according to traditional notions of how they should be represented. There have been periods in the history of painting, when artists have nearly ceased to live in contact with nature ; but, although during such periods there has sometimes been developed an extraordinary mastery of the technique of art, yet these have always been periods of decadence ; because nothing will do as a substitute for the direct and living perception of the world.

All this applies in the fullest degree to the occupation of the preacher. He is nothing unless he speaks that which he knows and testifies to that which he has seen. There have been periods in the history of preaching, when preachers have relied on the perceptions of their predecessors, and merely reproduced in their sermons the phrases in which Christian experience had come to be described. But these have always been epochs of decay. Even the phraseology of Scripture may be thus misused. Whatever else may be implied in inspiration, it means at least that the human authors of Scripture had a genius for religion. In them the natural power of perceiving God was potentiated by a supernatural influence, which ordinary men cannot reach. They saw God on every hand, and their perceptions of Him were infallibly veracious. Their writings, therefore, remain for all time the norm for the interpretation of God, and for this purpose they are invaluable. But this does not mean, that we are to rely in such a way on their intuitions as not to take the trouble to see God for ourselves. On the contrary, the Bible exists for the very purpose of leading us forth to a God and a spiritual life, accessible now, whereof we may obtain fresh and present intelligence by our own experience. And it is this personal acquaintance with the Unseen which is the charm and the power of preaching.

If from all the objects in which it inheres —heaven and earth and sea, the soul and the history of man—the wandering and impalpable essence of beauty were to gather and condense itself, and appear among men in some form of the flesh, in which all the powers of beauty—beauty of form, beauty of color, beauty of sound, beauty of sentiment—were subtly combined—a form more enchanting than even that which was born out of the foam of the Cyprian wave—the test of the artistic spirit would lie in the welcome and homage which would be awakened in artistic natures by this embodiment of beauty. No such vision will ever break on the world of art. But the Divine essence, which encompasses the worlds and is the life of all creatures, which pervades heaven and earth and the conscience of man, has gathered and embodied itself and walked forth among men in the flesh. In the life of Jesus of Nazareth—in His benevolent acts, in His words of grace and truth, and in His atoning death—God has been manifested in a light so clear that there is in it no darkness at all ; and the supreme test of the spirit of the preacher consists in the homage of admiration and love which it renders to the Word made Flesh.

THE C.M.S. AND BISHOP BLYTH.

From *The Rock* (Ch. Eng.), London, September 4, 1891.

The following is the heading and full text of the Archbishop's Award :—

THE BISHOP OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN JERUSALEM AND THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

Certain questions having become matters of controversy between the Bishop of the English Church in Jerusalem and the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, it was evidently desirable that the points in discussion should be suitably settled.

In 1890 the Bishop published in England, but did not deliver or issue in the first instance to his clergy, " A Primary Charge." A review of this pamphlet was published with other documents by the Society on the 9th Jan. 1891, entitled " C.M.S. in Palestine."

The Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury on 6th Feb. requested " the President and their Lordships the Bishops of the Upper House to consider the statements contained in the Bishop's Charge, and the reply of the Church Missionary Society, and to take such steps as they might deem best for removing existing difficulties, strengthening the catholic relations of the Church of England with the Orthodox Churches of the East, and rendering renewed and vigorous support to the Mission among the Mohammedans in Palestine."

The Upper House on the 7th Feb. resolved " that the matter be referred to the President to be dealt with at his Grace's discretion."

The Archbishop of Canterbury on the 18th Feb. in a letter to the President of the C.M.S. offered to inquire, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York and other of the Bishops, into the difficulties which had arisen, in the hope of arriving at a satisfactory settlement, and to this end requested the assistance of the Committee. The Archbishop also invited the assistance of Bishop Blyth.

The General Committee of C.M.S. on March 10th, 1891, gladly undertook to render to the Archbishop every assistance in order that fresh information upon the topics under discussion might be afforded him. The reference of such a matter to the Archbishops and Bishops is in fact in accordance with the Laws and Regulations of the Society.

The Bishop expressed his satisfaction with the proposal and returned to England.

We therefore, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, and of Carlisle in the vacancy of the See of York, proceeded on the 24th and 25th of July to investigate the several existing difficulties. The following is our advice.

1. Missionary Conference.—In the first two years of his episcopate the Bishop presided at one of two half-yearly meetings of the Missionary Conference as his predecessors had done. The Parent Committee was then consulted as to whether the Bishop was *ex officio* Chairman of that Conference ; and replied that, according to rule, his Lordship was not a member of that body. The Bishop claims the right of attending and presiding as belonging to his office.

It appeared in our inquiry that the body called a " Missionary Conference" in the Regulations of the C.M.S., and altogether constituted by those Regulations, exists in each region where the Society has Missionaries, and consists of the Ordained and Lay Missionaries employed by the Society, European or Native, except Assistant Native clergymen ; that the latter class, and other Pastors and Catechists of the Church, can be admitted with the sanction of the Parent Committee, and other persons only by Resolution of the same Committee ; that this Conference by rule is summoned to meet by the Secretary, and appoints its own

Chairman at each meeting. The objects of the Conference are also strictly defined. They include review of progress, encouragement of local action and organization within the Mission, and brotherly exhortation. Further, where there is no "Corresponding Committee" (as there is not in Palestine), they have duties which are thus described in detail in the *Laws and Regulations of C.M.S. part* V. *sect.* II. "*Additional Regulations*" 1–7 :—

(1) To exercise a general superintendence over Educational Establishments designed for the benefit of the whole Mission ; such as, Colleges for Training Native Teachers, Model Schools, &c. ; and to appoint Visiting Committees to inspect and report upon the same unless other provision be made by the Parent Committee.

(2) To confer upon translations of the Holy Scriptures and Book of Common Prayer, and upon the preparation of other vernacular works ; also to consult upon linguistic questions arising out of the same.

(3) To consult upon and propose to the Parent Committee the location or changes of location of Missionaries whenever circumstances require it ; and generally to propose to the Parent Committee such changes as may seem to them desirable for the interests of the Mission.

(4) To examine and receive such Catechists, European or Native, as it may be proposed to receive into *local connection* with the Mission, who must be recommended by one at least of the Society's Missionaries in the district, who has had sufficient opportunities of testing the character and Missionary qualifications of the candidate, and is willing to certify that he will be a suitable Agent of the Society, upon the principle "that none but spiritual agents can carry on spiritual work."

(5) To examine the cases of Schoolmasters whom it is proposed to receive into local connection.

(6) To make arrangements respecting the location, employment, and dismissal of Agents in local connection.

(7) To consult upon the erection, if the necessities of the Mission may require it, of new Missionary Buildings, of Churches, or of School houses, and to refer plans and estimates for the same to the consideration of the Finance Committee or any other Committee which may be appointed for this purpose by the Parent Committee.

It should be added that the "Missionary Conference" is parallel to, and on the same footing with, the "Finance Committee," being entirely under the control and direction of the "Parent Committee."

We recognize the fact that a special discussion of such specified subjects as are here described is generally necessary among those subordinately entrusted with their administration.

But it appears to us that it is scarcely consistent with the dignity of the Bishop that he should be a member of a Committee whose duties, although most useful, are local, personal, or strictly limited by Regulations of the Society ; that he should be summoned by one of his clergy to attend ; and that it should be constitutionally possible that if he attended another chairman might be elected.

In the long vacancy of the See this Conference has undoubtedly discussed matters which are not properly within its scope, because some settlement on the spot was peremptorily required. Indeed, the practice of the Bishop's attendance, which had insensibly grown up in contravention of regulation (for the Bishop had never been nominated a member), had led to its being consulted by him on affairs quite beyond its range. If, consequently, the Conference has itself extended its purview to disciplinary questions, which are beyond its powers, this is not to us a matter of great surprise. But it is desirable that the irregularity should be ended, and that the Conference should henceforth confine itself to its defined subjects ; and the Parent Committee in England considers that the subjects proposed for its discussion should in all cases be submitted beforehand to the Bishop, and that any suggestions or resolutions arrived at should be immediately reported to him, for his consideration and approval. If any of its *acta* or *agenda* should appear to be *ultra vires*, the Parent Committee would immediately require that they should be referred back to the Bishop.

It would follow that when the Conference desired the counsel of the Bishop on any matters, the suitable course would be that its members should wait on him by deputation or otherwise, and not that he should be summoned or invited to attend their meeting.

We are not, therefore, of opinion that the position of the Bishop would be in any way strengthened, his dignity consulted, or his authority duly observed, if he had a place within the Conference.

But we are strongly of opinion, and in this opinion we have the hearty concurrence of the C.M.S. Parent Committee, that the proper body to be convened at stated times for the consideration of all branches of the work, experience, and duty of the clergy in Palestine, and of subjects which arise out of them, is a Synod of the whole body of clergy, including the missionaries. The Reports of the "Missionary Conference" would be then brought before the Synod by the Bishop at his discretion, like other reports of work within his jurisdiction.

It would be for the Bishop to consider whether it might be desirable to convene a still larger body, containing a representation of Laymen (answering in a measure to a "Diocesan Conference" in England); but in any case we think that a Synod of Clergy should be assembled annually by the Bishop's authority, and the Committee of the C.M.S. entertain no doubt that every Missionary would gladly attend it.

Neither of such bodies could possess, from the nature of the case, legislative power. But their deliberative meetings would be of the greatest assistance to the Bishop, and a powerful encouragement in all branches of the work.

2. RELATIONS BETWEEN CLERGY.—We are informed that the relation of the Assistant Native Clergy to the Missionaries is at present analogous to that of Licensed Curates to Incumbents at home, and no suggestion of change has been brought before us. There is this difference, viz., that the stipends of the Assistant Native Clergy are paid by the Society, and therefore (as is admitted) their immediate relation to the Bishop and their appeal to him cannot be precisely upon the same footing as in England. Difficulties, however, which have in the past arisen have now been adjusted; and it is believed that the necessities of the position are not such as to create new difficulties. Mutual consideration of the force of the Bishop's License and of the position of the Society should obviate any need of rules. The Superintendents ought to report immediately both to the Bishop and to the Society any case in which they feel called upon to take action. They should not take action in cases where their report will suffice, and any such action should be in all cases temporary, not exceeding suspension from discharge of duty. We consider that any financial change, e.g., suspension of stipend, should be under other authority, and not be exercised by the Missionaries.

The peculiar circumstances of the country may offer important opportunities for carrying on distinct work among Jews within an area already assigned in the Bishop's License to a Missionary of C.M.S. In such cases, wherever the Bishop licenses a special Agent or Missionary for this work, we think that the License should expressly limit any such Agent's work to this definite duty; and he should be instructed to take no work among resident English or others outside his special function except upon express agreement of the Bishop with the Society's representatives.

All agree that there is need of more workers in the field. The Society cannot increase its staff with due regard to the claims of other places, and we consider it, therefore, very necessary that in many places not occupied by the Society the Bishop himself should plant, as he proposes, medical missionaries, women workers, and other agents, lay or clerical, and we strongly recommend the development of the Bishop's fund for these important purposes and for the buildings which the Bishop earnestly desires to raise.

3. MOHAMMEDANISM.—With regard to the diffusion of Christianity among Mohammedans, the Bishop and the Society appear to be at one in principle. This was and is the primary object of the whole work. It is work difficult and discouraging in the highest degree—partly on account of recognizable merits in the system which has to be displaced, and of the high character of many who sincerely live in its obedience. It is admitted on both sides that final success must be achieved mainly by the employment of well-instructed Natives, able and zealous to represent Christianity with knowledge and intelligence, in outlines free from idolatrous or superstitious practices despised by the Moslem. It is manifest that at present the work has to be carried on indirectly through the progress of the Native Christians themselves. Some diversities in practice are thus not only unavoidable, but are even desirable. The stage of experiment has not yet been traversed. We think that the Society will do well to give careful consideration to some suggestions of the Bishop in detail.

4. PROSELYTISM.—The Bishop has stated "that the C.M.S. engages in systematic aggression on the Churches of the East, in concert with similar efforts of the American Presbyterians . . . and in this view their various agents are appointed."

The C.M.S. has, in reply, clearly stated that if any agents have proceeded in this manner they were not appointed with this view; and that aggression on other Churches is not part of its system; its ultimate aim is the evangelization of Mohammedans; it believes that any impression to be made on Mohammedans at large must be mainly made by Oriental Christians, who nevertheless have for centuries done nothing for their enlightenment; that to that end reforms are essential, and it has circulated the

Holy Scriptures among them as the true basis and hope of such reform. The statement made by the C.M.S. is that "They preach the Gospel according to the doctrines of the Church of England to all who are willing to hear, and admit to the services held by them all who are willing to attend —whether Mohammedans, Jews, or Christians, and give instruction to all inquirers, of whatever religion." "There is no direct, special, controversial teaching in our schools against the errors of the Eastern Churches; our teaching is positive and constructive, not destructive."

The Bishop has now declared himself thankful that the Society thus distinctly repudiates the employment of agents for aggressive purposes, and point by point his Lordship assents to the above principles. The instruction of individuals whose consciences are affected, and their association with the English Church, he regards as inevitable. He informs us "that he has never differed from the C.M.S. as regards the treatment of individuals—and that he does not see how to limit their reception." He thinks it impossible to exclude hearers from our Churches. The highest dignitaries not infrequently attend our services.

We find no indication that the Society desires to act in concert with the American Presbyterians, or through agents trained by that body, in aggression upon other Churches. Circumstances which may have given color to the idea are either of the far past, or are explicable and explained. There is no doubt that the agents are constantly placed in positions of great difficulty owing to the want of education, the peasant rank, and in some cases the low moral standard of the monks and clergy, and that everything which tends to elevate or educate these, or to produce the desire for internal improvement, is not only beneficial to the Churches themselves, and welcome to their leading men, but is also the surest road to the conversion of Moslems.

The Society judges that in the course of the progress which all desire, the formation of small congregations is practically unavoidable, but that such progress would in time to come itself render them unnecessary. The Bishop does not take this in view; he thinks that much may be done by frank communication with ecclesiastical authorities in cases as they occur. But he also considers that the congregations which have long existed could not be disbanded, and would simply become Presbyterian if neglected. He pleads strongly for more and better appointed churches for them and for the English residents in each place. We have not found it necessary to pursue the question of what other provision would be at first possible for converts from Mohammedanism, or for individuals impelled on enquiry to unite themselves to us, or for the families of either. The treatment of the matter will be much in the Bishop's hands, and for the rest we are sure the Society will give the utmost consideration to the Bishop's suggestions.

We think that personal explanation has smoothed the principal difficulties of the situation. In ground so uncertain and exceptional it is not possible to formulate rules, still less to adhere to them. But we are persuaded that as difficult cases arise, mutual intelligence and good-will promise all needful solutions.

5. CONFIRMATION AND CHRISM.—The question is whether children, brought up by English churchmen or by others, who have received in infancy the Chrism of the Greek Church, but have not had the laying-on of hands by the Bishop, should be admitted without it to Holy Communion.

While we forbear to assert that those who are held in the Greek Church to have fully received Confirmation, ought nevertheless in all cases to receive the Laying-on of Hands as a condition of being admitted to Holy Communion in our Church, yet we think that the Laying-on of Hands ought not to be refused to any candidates with regard to whom the Bishop himself is satisfied that, however they may have reached it, they truly entertain an intelligent and conscientious desire for it. Nor do we think it would be difficult to explain to the authorities of the Greek Church that, while the English Church acknowledges the right of all churches to determine, within the limits allowed by Scripture, their own ritual, it lays great stress on what it believes to be the Apostolic method of administering Confirmation as recorded in the Scriptures and preserved in our own Church.

We think it desirable to point out, since we observe that the Lambeth Conference, 1888, is frequently cited as having given a decision on this question, that neither the Encyclical Letter nor the Resolutions passed by that Conference make any mention of the subject.

In conclusion we press alike on the Bishop and on the Society the exceeding duty which lies upon them to preserve both the unity and the dignity of their counsels and action in presentment of the true position of the English Church. Our Church has passed without break through the Reform of which she believes Eastern churches to stand in need. Her doctrines, ordinances, and rites, she presents as primitive, apostolical, and Scriptural. She feels intensely that it is her bounden duty, and the duty of other churches, to convert the Jew, the Moslem, and the Heathen to Christ.

In Palestine the situation is one of duty, but it is also one of peculiar and solitary difficulty. In that country, where religious interests cluster thickest, our Church has claimed a right to be represented as an integral part of Christendom. Not only must the long abeyance there of its chief office and overseership have of necessity in some measure deflected the common current of order, but, under any circumstances, Church life is lived, and action taken amid relations elsewhere unknown. We act there in the presence of several ancient Christian churches in which there is much that is impressive, and much wanting; which have been kept in disability for centuries, and which we believe we can aid without arrogance or interference. We act in presence of the power whose oppressions have been and are so effectual, whose religion we desire to change as bearers of the Gospel, and which yet we must and can finally assail only through the clergy and laity of the very churches which it at present contemns. We act among a steadily increasing population whose past and whose future is bound up in the very soil; to them also we labor to reveal the true meaning of their own history and their own hope.

It is not possible to put in words the strenuousness of the duty of peacefulness.

A community in which varying views did not exist as to the wisest or safest means of carrying out such work in such surroundings would be a body neither Catholic nor human. But we earnestly say that we have heard and seen among those who are alike devotedly engaged in the work no diversities of opinion which to our minds will justify any absence of practical harmony. Our business is with the future rather than with the past, and we believe that the dispassionate explanations and candid listening which either side gave to the other in our presence will, by the help of the suggestions which in our office we have been enabled to offer, have cleared the way of peace.

Edw. Cantuar.
F. Londin.
B. F. Dunelm.
A. W. Winton.
H. Carliol.

Lambeth, August 17th, 1891.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM—EXPRESSIONS OF OPINION BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR, REV. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., AND REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, M.A.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenom.), New York, October 17, 1891.

A Church of England View.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR.

No one can doubt the loss which has resulted to the kingdom of Christ from the disunion, and still more from the mutual hostilities, of Christians. Unity is a thing which we all profess to desire, and even the dullest imagination may conceive what results might be accomplished both at home and abroad by the concentrated effort of all Christians, working together, heart and soul, for the achievement of common ends. To borrow a recent illustration, separate drops of water have but little force, but unite them into one great volume, and they form a Niagara whose unceasing power might quench the fires of Etna. If the time, the energy, the temper, wasted in futile and often bitter controversies were diverted to worthier ends, the diminution of friction and the increase of enthusiasm might add an almost incalculable momentum to efforts directed against the real foes of mankind. What economy might be effected by merging into one the expensive and elaborate organizations for good of a multitude of religious bodies! What a hindrance to missions would be removed if Christianity faced heathendom with an undivided front, instead of sometimes showing, as now it shows, four or five different groups of missionaries working in jealous, and to the heathen incomprehensible, isolation in some single field! How far greater would be the power to face the deadly evils of the present, and the menacing problems of the future, if, instead of showing in every little town—almost in every hamlet—specimens of what Milton calls "the subdichotomies of petty schisms"—often separated from each other and from the Church of England by unessential and even infinitesimal differences about minor and highly disputable matters of opinion—the ardor of Christian love burned on God's altar with an undivided flame! We profess to deplore our disagreements and oppositions. We pray that the universal Church may be inspired continually with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord. We pray for "grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions." Unless all these prayers and professions be hypocritical, they should be followed by real efforts. Now, there have been marked signs, of late, that the desire for some form of reunion among Christian bodies is more than an idle profession. One such sign was the Lambeth circular. Another is the convening of various informal meetings like the Langham Street Conference, and Canon Fremantle's "Christian Conference," and the existence of Lord Nelson's "Home Reunion Society." A third is the publication of various books intended to formulate the terms of some eirenicon. We sympathize with all who work in this direction, but certain conditions are indispensable to their success.

1. Unity is not uniformity. Unity is in the highest sense essential, nor can the Israel of God truly flourish so long as Ephraim envies Judah, and Judah vexes Ephraim. But *Uniformity* is not essential, nor perhaps even desirable. It certainly does not exist in the Church of England. If the Church of England can hold together as one body in spite of differences between its members which separate them more widely from each other than from some bodies outside her pale, it ought not to be impossible to find terms of a concordat which would at once render it possible to reunite various dissenting communities to the National Church.

2. But this cannot be done without mutual concessions. Nothing but bitterness can arise from the uncompromising accentuation of points of disagreement. Take, for instance, the question of the Historic Episcopate. It is certain that many are convinced that it is a matter of primary importance, essential to the *bene esse*, if not to the *esse*, of any Church. But many Christians, equally learned, equally devout, are no less unalterably convinced that it is not. Now, contradictories cannot be reconciled, and if neither side is likely to convert the other, would it not be better to find some *modus vivendi* in which both can harmoniously work together? In the Church on earth there always must be, as there always have been, many folds—many folds which differ from each other in construction—while yet there always has been, and always will be, one flock.

3. And this is certain—that there can be no more fatal cause of exasperation and permanent disunion than will arise from any attempt on the part of the Church of England, or any of its members, to *unchurch* the Dissenters; to treat them as though they were mere outsiders in the common Church of Christ; to hand them over with gracious and patronizing arrogance to uncovenanted mercies. The great majority of the Nonconformist bodies hold with us, and no less firmly than we do, the great eternal Christian verities. They belong, no less than we do, to the great body of those to whom St. Paul sent his blessing—namely, to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. No less than we, they are "very members incorporate in the mystical body of Christ which is the blessed company of all faithful people." They have been enriched by the divine blessing, and have shown in the ripest specimens of saintliness those fruits of the Spirit by which they may be known as belonging to the Church of God. Will any member of the Church of England, or even of the Church of Rome out of the darkest corner of Mexico or Spain, dare to say that the door of heaven shall not open to these as widely and as spontaneously as to any one of us? If, then, they shall be no less than ourselves honored members of the Church of the redeemed in heaven, it seems to be a small and unwarrantable bigotry to treat them, or to speak of them, as though they do not belong to the Church of Christ on earth. Instead of adopting or hinting at such untenable and exasperating insinuations, can we not provoke one another to love and good works? Can we not, cheerfully and always, put in the forefront the eternal truths of the Gospel respecting which we are unanimous, and relegate to the background the question of organization and minor differences about which as yet we are unable to agree?

A Congregationalist's View.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D.

I entirely agree with the desire for Union which is growing on every hand. Is unity compatible with diversity? I answer emphatically in the affirmative. Diversity is a note of life: unity is a note of love. My personal conception of orthodoxy enables me to mingle freely and educationally with men from whom I differ widely in intellectual speculation. I am more and more convinced that men will never be united in opinion. Nor is it desirable that they should be. Opinion is necessarily variable and progressive. My opinion is but a line in a diary. To-morrow it may be changed. The business of men is to take more care for moral constancy than for verbal consistency. It is along this line that I find insuperable objections to written test-creeds. To write such creeds seems to me to distrust the Holy Ghost, and to create an artificial or professional conscience. I now speak of such creeds as are regarded as final and practically infallible—not as indicating general and substantial beliefs as a basis of trustful co-operation. If I may speak frankly—and I may do so because I speak on my own responsibility alone—I would take all written creeds of all churches and deposit them in the centre of the hottest furnace. They create false orthodoxies. They breed superstitions. They divide the loyalty which is due to the Scriptures alone. They make men word-peckers and nibblers, adverb-and-preposition Christians, rather than humble-hearted and beneficent worshippers.

Congregationalists have no written creed, but they have what, in my judgment, is infinitely worse. They have a syllabus which every man is allowed to treat as a theological football. It consists of words which every man may change, and of propositions which every man may modify or repudiate. It is full of I. O. U.'s, which no man ever signs, and it indicates barometrical pressure, by which no man regulates his clothing or his ventilation. It is a most ghostly and a most ghastly thing; a white spectre; a shapeless outline; an india-rubber idol (change the figure as your fancy wills) — something wholly destitute of dignity, having neither the form nor the power of authority. In addition to this pulpy syllabus, Congregationalists have in some cases theological trust-deeds, on the basis of which they hold their denominational property. These trust-deeds are never read. They are skeletons in the cupboard. Some churches do not even know where their trust-deeds are! All this is worse than farcical. Why not publicly proclaim the solemn and ennobling fact that our unity is in our love of truth rather than in its literal possession? To love truth is infinitely more than to know it. I hold that in proportion as a man is really evangelical, in the sense that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the world, is he large-minded, catholic, and hopeful. An evangelical little-man is a fraud and a pest.

Are we, then, to do away with opinions, with beliefs, with watchwords? It is impossible. We cannot live or associate without beliefs. But that is very different from organizing and reticulating them into elaborate or academic statements, and saying—"Believe these, or be heterodox." We can agree to love Christ without agreeing to define him. I do not admit that we are called to definition of a critical or pedantic kind. Christianity is not a trick in words. Christianity may be injured by its clever adapters. Faith is essential: detailed verbal statement may easily become mischievous. Words themselves have a fashion which passeth away. The word which is well understood to-day may have another and even an offensive meaning in a century. Our union, therefore, cannot be in our changeable words; it must be in our incorruptible love.

It is supposed that Congregationalists and Baptists might unite. I think they might approach. They must always maintain their distinctiveness. I do not understand how any man can be what is generally understood as a Baptist. But some of the greatest men have been Baptists and are Baptists. They cannot understand how anybody can be anything else. Very well. That did not hinder confidence and approach. Declare the difference (which is not merely ritual), and occupy the common ground of endeavoring to do good in the name and the power of Christ. If any man in my congregation wished to be baptized, he might spend the rest of his life in a reservoir or river without my seeking to interfere with his convictions. Indeed, I do not see why I should refuse to baptize him. Will Baptist ministers baptize little children? I would leave Baptism as an open question, on which the sincerest minds in all ages have been unable to agree, saying, Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. On this basis Congregationalists and Baptists might at once approach each other in the most trustful spirit. They meet one another socially, they preach for one another congregationally, why should they not by public and formal declaration (without interfering with their respective ecclesiastical frameworks) affirm their brotherhood and present a completer front to the world?

But this measure of union would by no means satisfy me. I would go much further, and would even go in hitherto forbidden directions. I would make excommunication on doctrinal grounds impossible. So long as there was no suspicion about a man's sincerity and general goodness of life, I would retain him in the Church, if he wished to remain, though great changes may have occurred in his intellectual views. One condition must, of course, be insisted upon. The man must not set himself to counterwork the prevailing and uniting sentiment of the community. If he must do that he is bound to do it from the outside.

A propagandist must find his own board and lodging. I hold that a church is not a debating club, but a school, a nursery, a protecting home. When a man thinks it necessary to go to war with his fellow-members, he is bound to surrender to them the advantages which they have conferred upon him, and to occupy independent ground. Men have no right to compromise one another. I draw a broad distinction between an earnest inquirer and a blatant or bitter controversialist. There is one man with whom I never unite, and I will name him by describing his unholy and monstrous tenet. He is the man who believes in the partiality of the Cross, or in what he blasphemously describes as "distinguishing grace." I always notice that he himself has been picked out for special favors. He makes it clear to his own mind that, whoever is saved or lost (even if his own children be in either number), he has been indispensable to the happiness of God. Any man who holds this doctrine I regard as an infidel of the worst type. How can I unite with such a man when I hold that Jesus Christ tasted death for every man, and, in Paul's language, gave himself a "ransom for all"? I believe in the universality of God's love. To that love and all its blessings I call the most reprobate and the most despairing of men. This is the sweet gospel to whose proclamation my whole life is called; when, therefore, I meet a man who glories in discriminating and specializing grace, I brand him as an enemy to the kingdom which he has never entered.

Christian union can never be realized by artificial means. There have always been many tinkers, willing, on remunerative terms, to do a good deal of ecclesiastical soldering. I have no faith in their motive or in their practice. The only union worth striving for, or praying for, is the union which flows from an ever-deepening and ever-heightening love of Christ. If we do not keep the first commandment, we can never keep the second. When our souls are full of the love of Christ, we cannot help loving the brethren. They belong to us and we belong to them. Not by parchments, resolutions, sub-committees, and compromises can Christian union ever be realized. It must come from the land of the green spring and the ruddy summer. There will be no earth-marks upon it. It will be as the dawn, silent, unaided, irresistible—a very miracle of blessedness. There are some things of a negative kind which we can all be doing. We can discourage censoriousness. We can frown down all spiteful criticism. We can put to silence the gainsaying of foolish men. Then, positively, we can preach with the eloquence of character, and lay hold of many by the beauty and unselfishness of our conduct who can never follow the subtleties and contradictions of our metaphysics.

Disputable questions of all sorts, and not of one sort only, must be left open if genuine union is to be realized and enjoyed—such questions, of course, being disputable as among believers, and not as viewed by hostile criticism. For example, how many theories are there of Inspiration? of the Atonement? of Baptism? of Churchism? of Priesthood? Clearly upon these points we have no more to hope for from verbal controversy; we must, therefore, adopt the working condition of union, which is that the best and wisest men may take differing and even opposing views, and yet hold substantially the same central and controlling faith. Men may hold that the Bible is inspired without asking, How? in what degree? to what extent? Inspiration is greater than any of its definitions can be. It would be enough for me if any Church believed in Inspiration—whatever the academic theory of it might be. It would also be enough as a basis of union, wherever union is mutually desired, that a man should believe in the Christian Church, whether Papal, Anglican, or Congregational. Here again the rule applies. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. I hold that individual conviction is infinitely preferable either to hereditary assent or the spiritual paralysis which is glossed over with the name of indifference. My rule of interpretation enables me to unite with many who are exiled or stigmatized as unorthodox. I find the point of union in a common sincerity. The one man whose influence is fatal to union is the dogmatist—a term often misunderstood and misapplied. In my judgment, a man is a dogmatist when he says that he alone is right, and that what he says is complete, absolute, and final. This position may never be set forth in plain terms, yet the spirit of it may be detected in many a monstrous claim. The man who sets himself up as the censor of his brethren, always knowing who is right and who is wrong, and never even hinting at his personal fallibility, is not a Christian, though he speak louder than the winds and make the most daring professions of piety. The withdrawal of such a man would be a gain to any Christian society.

A Methodist's View.

BY THE REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, M.A.

Undoubtedly one of the most characteristic ecclesiastical features of our day is a widespread yearning for reunion. Even the unhappy disposition to accentuate some of those ecclesiastical tenets which are the only real hindrances to reunion is an indication of this movement of thought; those who spend so much time in claiming for themselves ecclesiastical monopolies and in trying to unchurch their fellow-Christians do so under the delusion that such proceedings on their part promote the unity of Christendom. When we remember how far disunion has been carried in the past, this feature of our own day is very astonishing. I think all really catholic Christians may congratulate themselves that the centrifugal forces have now spent their strength, and that the centripetal forces are becoming more and more powerful. At one time, not very long ago, we heard a good deal about the blessedness of disunion and the immense advantages which arose from the divisions of Christendom. The utter absurdity of that sentiment, once very popular in certain Dissenting quarters, was first brought home to me, when I was a mere boy, by reading, in the pages, I think, of the *Westminster Review*, an article upon the subject of the Reunion of Christendom. The writer of that article, regarding the proposal from the standpoint of those who have rejected Christianity, offered the strongest opposition to all proposals of reunion, because, he said, if these Christians reunite, "What's to become of us?" He declared that if the Christians of Europe once stood shoulder to shoulder their power would be irresistible, and there would be no room for the enemies of the Christian faith. I realized in a moment that the disunion of Christendom was the opportunity of atheism, and that the very terror which the prospect of reunion excited in certain infidel quarters was one of the strongest reasons why Christians should do their utmost to promote that consummation. I do not deny or doubt that in the unhappy past the disruption of Christendom was inevitable—was the lesser of two evils. No really Christlike man would hesitate for a moment to sacrifice external unity to truth and the supreme commands of Christ. It would be immeasurably better that the Christian Church should be shattered into ten thousand fragments than that the rights of conscience, and especially the direct right of every human being to come to Christ as his personal Saviour, should be abandoned. Nevertheless, it seems to me that disunion is only the lesser of two evils. The fact that under certain circumstances it was inevitable does not contradict the indisputable fact that it is accompanied by terrible practical evils. The waste of time and energy occasioned by the fratricidal strife of Christians is incalculable. The loss of hope, *esprit de corps*, enthusiasm, and expectation of victory on the part of the Christians is even more deplorable. Nothing tends to demoralize any army so much as strife in its own ranks. The buoyancy, the confidence, of primitive Christianity has been almost lost in consequence of heartrending and hope-shattering strife. Above all, the *odium theologicum* has brought the Christian Churches into public contempt, and has furnished the enemies of Christianity with their most persuasive and crushing arguments. As the result of our disunion, the great majority of the European races are at this moment outside the Christian Church, and the overwhelming majority of the human race are heathen. These evils are so colossal that we ought to be prepared, for the sake of union, to sacrifice everything except loyalty to Christ. I cannot even understand the state of the Christian man's mind who would hesitate for a single moment to give up everything that was not absolutely essential, rather than postpone for a day the union which would bring us irresistible strength in the presence of the enemies of Christ. I have not finally abandoned the hope that the whole of Christendom may some day be reunited. There is no insuperable difficulty even now in the way of a general reunion of all the Churches which may be called evangelical. The Nonconformists of this country, the great Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and the Continent, the vast Protestant communities of our kinsmen beyond the seas, and the evangelical and liberal section of the Anglican communion, are in substantial agreement at this moment.

I have long felt that the late Frederick Myers, the author of the remarkable "Catholic Thoughts on the Bible and Theology," which all good men should read, was right in his conviction that the only real dividing line among the Christian Churches is the doctrine of the Apostolical succession. That is the watershed of Christendom; and the ultimate direction of thought and action is determined by our relation to that doctrine, whether we are on this side of it or on that. When any one can deliberately state, as the late Canon Liddon stated in St. Paul's Cathedral, that the episcopate is essential, not only to the *bene esse*, but to the very *esse* of the Christian Church, he has cut himself away from his fellow-Christians by an almost impassable gulf. All who do not hold that amazing doctrine could, without any serious difficulty, establish a *modus vivendi* with one another, provided always that the question of political Church establishments was settled. The only real hindrance to the immediate reunion of the Presbyterians of Scotland is in the establishment of one of the fragments of Presbyterianism; and in this country the liberal and evangelical section of the Church of England are immeasurably nearer to us than to the extreme party whose eloquent mouthpiece I have just quoted. Nothing but the Establishment controversy prevents that fact from being realized.

But must we utterly despair of the ultimate union even of those who at this moment make the episcopal system essential to the existence of the Christian Church, and so doing excommunicate millions of the best Christians in the world? The views expressed by the late Canon Liddon are, of course, held with equal vehemence by the Greek Church and the Roman Catholic Church. In some respects the Roman Catholic Church is further from us even than the Greek Church, for the Greek Church herself rejects the Papacy and the late Ultramontane and Jesuitical developments of so-called Latin Christianity. If, therefore, we can discover a ray of hope, even amid the gloom of Roman intolerance, nothing is impossible. I cannot help thinking that Roman Catholics of the type of Cardinal Manning would ultimately find a way of reconciling their views with a due recognition of those whom Christ has unmistakably recognized, and of modifying their irreconcilable attitude to an extent that seems incredible now. Some time ago Cardinal Manning was good enough to give me his work on "The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost," and I was surprised to read in the very first sentences of that book the following statements:

> Two Pontiffs have condemned as heresy the two following assertions: That the heathen, and the Jews, and heretics receive no influence from Jesus Christ, but that their will is without help—that is, without grace—was condemned as a heresy by Alexander VIII. Again, that there is no grace given outside the Church was also condemned as heresy by Clement XI. The work, therefore, of the Holy Ghost, even in the order of nature, so to say—that is, outside of the Church of God and of the revealed knowledge of Jesus Christ among the heathen—that working is universal in the soul of every individual human being; and if they who receive the assistance of the Holy Ghost are faithful in corresponding with it, God, in His unrevealed mercies, will deal with them in ways secret from us. His mercies, unknown to us, are over all His works, and the infinite merits of the Redeemer of the world are before the mercy-seat of our heavenly Father, for the salvation of those that follow even the little light which in the order of nature they receive.

Surely in this remarkable paragraph we have a loophole through which divine love and common sense may stream in! If two Roman Pontiffs have declared *ex cathedra* that heathen, Jews, and heretics receive the grace of Jesus Christ, and that the work of Jesus Christ is carried on successfully outside the pale of what Cardinal Manning at present calls "the Church," the growth of true enlightenment in the Roman communion may, ages or centuries hence, make a *modus vivendi* possible even between Protestants and Roman Catholics. No one will suppose that I have any sympathy with distinctively Romish doctrines. I belong to the only race in Europe which has neither a Roman Catholic church nor an infidel hall of science. We Welshmen allow no one to come between us and Jesus Christ. He is the supreme Head of all our churches, and he only. We cannot recognize any man as his vicar, because we deny that he is absent from earth. He is here in the midst of us now, and therefore there is no more room among us Welsh Christians for any vicar of Christ than there is in this country, where the British sovereign herself resides, room for a viceroy. Nevertheless, although I am apparently at this moment as far removed from Cardinal Manning as the poles, I know that he is a most devout Christian, and that he accepts the supreme headship of Christ as truly as I do, although in his theory there is a place for a human vicar for whom I cannot find any room. And I rejoice to believe that the humanity and catholic spirit which breathes through the passage I have quoted indicates that the logic of facts is stronger than the logic of theory, and that the best Roman Catholics are compelled in some way or other to explain the existence of millions of undoubted Christians outside their own communion.

One of the most remarkable and gratifying features of the age is the way in which Cardinal Manning, Bishop Vaughan, of Salford, and others of the Roman communion co-operate with their fellow-Christians in the promotion of all sorts of social reform. Here, indeed, reunion, in the sense of co-operation, can begin at once—has, indeed, begun already. It is already an accomplished fact that in the promotion of Temperance, Social Purity, Peace, and other great enterprises all Christians can once more act together; and let it not be forgotten that this has never hitherto been the case since the Reformation. I strongly agree with Dr. Paton, Lord Nelson, and others that Christian men of all communions should co-operate together as much as possible and as frequently as possible in the promotion of those public and humanitarian objects for the sake of which, without any compromise of supposed principle, it is now demonstrated they can unite: The passage I have quoted from Cardinal Manning is one of numerous evidences that those who hold extremely intolerant creeds are very much better than their creeds, and that what they truly believe is often much more catholic and Scriptural than what they "believe they believe." Let us hope that we are all very much better than we sometimes profess to be. We all more or less inherit the traditions and the prejudices and antipathies and shibboleths of the controversial and anarchical past; and the result is that we appear to differ even more widely than is really the case. Those of us who hope most ardently for vast and comprehensive reunions are well aware that courtship must precede marriage. As the old proverb says, "Those who marry in haste often repent at leisure." Let nothing be rushed; but let all Christian men do their utmost to co-operate with one another in every possible way. The real grounds of discord are to a much greater extent emotional than intellectual, sentimental than rational, and when we come to know one another we like one another; and it is astonishing how differences grow less and difficulties disappear under these genial circumstances. I start, therefore, with the broad principle that the ultimate reunion of Christendom is not an absolute impossibility to be dismissed at once and forever from our thoughts. I hold, with the great Christian philosopher Leibnitz, that it is a matter which should be seriously and constantly pondered. On the other hand, I fully recognize the fact that possibly hundreds of years must elapse before anything like a general reunion of Christendom comes within the range of practical ecclesiastical politics.

If reunion is ever to take place, it must be brought about by the corporate decision of the great Christian communities acting as a whole. There are some exceedingly surprising persons who imagine that they can restore the unity of Christendom by stealing individual members or families from other Christian bodies, and adding them to their own! Any one who reflects can see that this process of gaining over supposed "heretics" or "schismatics" one by one is mathematically impossible. All the Christian communities which are regarded by some as outside the Christian Church are now numbered by millions, and no one in his sober senses can suppose that the process of stealing one here and one there can ever result in bringing these millions over. Take, for example, my own communion. There are now 30,000,000 Methodists on this planet. We are far more numerous than the Anglican Church or any other Church except the Greek and Roman. Does any one suppose for a moment that it would be possible to bring back all those millions one by one, or family by family, to the Church of which John Wesley was the minister? It is simply impossible. The largest conceivable number of such personal ecclesiastical changes does not produce the least appreciable effect upon the size of the community they leave. The attempt to proselytize individuals is simply as absurd as it is detestable, and can never succeed. We cannot blot out the world-wide effects of past history. We might as well try to drain the Lake of Geneva with a tea-cup. If anything effective is ever to be done, it must be achieved by approaching our fellow-Christians in their corporate capacity, and making proposals which are consistent with their conscientious convictions and self-respect, and which exhibit a readiness on our own part to make concessions for the sake of Jesus Christ.

I hope I have said enough to indicate that I have an open mind with respect to all reasonable proposals—that I am not wedded to any particular system or organization or method. I am prepared to concede everything except the Word of God and the spirit of Jesus Christ in order to secure the immense advantages of reunion.

The mention of the greatest of all names leads me to say, in conclusion, that I am persuaded the hindrances to reunion everywhere consist in a false definition of the "Church." So long as men, in the very teeth of history, and in contradiction to the New Testament, say, *Ubi ecclesia ibi Christus,* there is nothing before us except controversy and division. But when we are prepared to subordinate our own preferences and prejudices to facts—patent, indisputable facts—and when we are sufficiently reverent to regard the unmistakable imprimatur of God as of greater importance than the dicta of men, we shall say, *Ubi Christus ibi ecclesia;* and when this is said the reunion of Christendom is already practically achieved.

RELATIONS OF THE CLERGY TO THE FAITH AND ORDER OF THE CHURCH.

THIRD TRIENNIAL CHARGE OF THE RT. REV. HENRY C. POTTER, D.D., LL.D., THE BISHOP OF NEW YORK.

From *The Churchman* (Epis.), New York, October 10, 1891.

Brethren of the Clergy and Laity :—

Though, under the provisions of the canon prescribing that duty, it is competent to the Ordinary to deliver a charge to the clergy of his diocese at his discretion, it is not usual to do so oftener than once in three years. I might well be excused, therefore, from undertaking, and you from being called on to listen to, a form of address so extended, were it not that, in the first place, such charge is declared to be proper "at least once in three years," whereas I have attempted it already but twice in an episcopate of eight years ; and in the second place because it is plainly my duty to be governed by the far more important consideration of the exigency of any particular emergency in the life and work of the Church in this diocese.

Such an exigency, in my judgment, exists at present ; and I shall therefore ask your attention at this time to some considerations defining the Relations of the Clergy to the Faith and Order of the Church.

In discussing this subject it is proper that I should say that in its literary form—not at all in its substance—I shall hope in some particulars to recast what follows, parts of which have been somewhat hurriedly and interruptedly written.

The relations, you will observe, of the clergy. In other words, the relations of the clergy and the laity to the Church's Faith and Order are not identical. It is a very common misapprehension to suppose that they are ; and out of this misapprehension, I would remark at the outset, has come a large share of the confusion which to-day exists in men's minds with regard to the whole subject.

If we are to determine what are the relations of a layman to the faith and order of the Church, it would be proper, I should suppose, to turn to the offices of baptism, confirmation, and the Holy Communion, and to the catechism. When we do so, we find that the language which defines those relations, and determines the measure of obligation, in the matter of the Church's faith and order, of the laity, are of a very general character. How great is the liberty for the indulgence of what, in the phrase of the Roman obedience, are called "pious opinions," it is not my province now to attempt to define ; but I presume it would not be denied, for instance, that one could not be excluded from the Holy Communion because he did not accept *ex animo* Article XVII., nor because he confounded the doctrine of the Real Presence, as this Church holds and teaches the same, with the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation. Certainly, there is nothing, whether in the teaching of the Church or in her silence, to encourage, on the part of the faithful laity, indifference or ignorance as to matters of Christian doctrine or ecclesiastical order ; but just as certainly she has, as had her divine Lord and Head, a large and tender charity for an imperfect and halting faith ; and as the witness in the world of Him who so graciously welcomed one who could say no more than "Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief," even so, to day, unless she is untrue to her divine commission, it is her duty to welcome, and not to repel, those who have but the slenderest grasp of the primary truths of her creeds, even though they grope and stumble amid some of the phrases in which those truths are couched.

But while this is the relation of the laity to the faith and order of the Church, the relation of the clergy is a very different, a much less indefinite, and, in one sense, a much more restricted one. For the terms of that relation are to be found not alone by reference to the sources to which already I have alluded, but also in the language of those more precise and specific obligations which are contained in the questions and answers of the various offices embraced in the Ordinal. To take a single instance as illustrative of the difference between the two classes. When an adult comes to Holy Baptism he is asked, "Do you believe all the articles of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed ?" And if such an one, at such a point, having answered, as the office provides, "I do," should further be interrogated by some superserviceable zeal interpolating into the office its own personal opinions, "Do you accept unreservedly and literally, as scientifically true, the Biblical account of the six days of creation ?" or, "Do you not reject the doctrine of a tactual succession in the ministry as a vain superstition ?" and should be required to give answers in accordance with the prepossessions of his questioner, it would be entirely proper for the candidate for Holy Baptism to decline to answer questions which are, under such circumstances, simply a bald impertinence ; even as it would be the duty of the Ordinary promptly to call to account a priest who, under such circumstances, should most unwarrantably refuse to administer Holy Baptism.

(1) But if, on the other hand, a candidate for the diaconate, the priesthood, or the episcopate, should disown the miraculous element in the four Gospels, or the authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith, or the respect and submission due to the godly judgment of the bishop, then the appeal of such an one to the promises of his baptism would be entirely aside from the question ; since to these have been added those further and more definite and specific obligations which are contained in the office which admitted him to this or that rank in the sacred ministry. For instance, when one is ordained to the diaconate he makes a declaration as to his belief concerning the "Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments," which, while it does not bind him to any particular theory of inspiration with regard to these books, and while it does not prevent him from recognizing in them both a human and divine element, does bind him to accept them as "Canonical Scriptures" set forth by the authority of the Church for the edification of its people, concerning which, while it is entirely competent to him to consider them as a literature as well as part of a revelation, it is not competent to him to deal with them as if they were committed to him merely and only as literature.

Again, in the case of one ordained to the priesthood, it is demanded, "Will you give your faithful diligence so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church hath received the same?" It would seem here that an assent to this demand created at once a new and specific obligation, not alone to "minister doctrine, sacraments and discipline," but no less to minister them as—*i.e.*, in the same sense as that in which—"this Church hath received the same." And, if the sense in which this Church has received them is made plain not alone in the two creeds set forth in her formularies, but elsewhere in other offices and formularies of equal authority and obligation, then it would seem plain that such construction or understanding of them was of equal, and equally binding, obligation ; and that, so far as holding, or teaching any other construction of them was concerned, one who was under the obligation of an ordination vow had parted with his individual discretion.

Yet again, and in the case of one consecrated to the office of a bishop, it is exacted that such an one shall take an oath of "conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," and this plainly denies to one under such solemn obligations the liberty to deny or disown such doctrine, discipline or worship in whatsoever particular. All these are obligations peculiar not to the laity but to the clergy. They belong to a separate class of vows, and they bind those who have made them in a way which is different, because it is so much farther-reaching and more precise than those elementary vows which are alone the conditions of ordinary Christian discipleship.

The distinction is one which, in the matter of the relations of the clergy to the faith and order of the Church is fundamental ; and it is one which, if it is only held in mind, ought at once and finally to dispose of a popular form of criticism and protest, in this connection widely prevalent. In commenting upon discussions which have lately obtained elsewhere than within the Church, as to the matter of re-casting inherited formularies and confessions, it has recently been said that there are men who admit that the formularies of theology should be recast in order to bring them into closer harmony with modern life and thought, and who, nevertheless, oppose and persecute all who attempt to recast any particular formula. "To say," observes this critic, "that such an attitude is illogical, inadequately describes it. It is really immoral, and it inflicts a grievous injury upon the Church. One can respect the earnestness and consistency of the thorough-going conservative who opposes change because he believes the formula to be divinely true. But the attitude of the so-called conservative who admits the force of the arguments against traditional theology, and at the same time raises a hue and cry against those who adduce them, merits only indignation." This is popular language, but I prefer to borrow it because it sets forth a popular misapprehension in a very plausible and very intelligible way.

But plainly, its whole force turns upon the question, who are they who are adducing these arguments, whether against the traditional authority or the traditional order of the Church ? What shall be the bounds of the liberty which shall be conceded to Christian scholarship and learning, outside of the ministry in this matter, I am not now called upon to define, but what ought to be those metes and bounds in the case of men who are in Holy Orders there ought to be no doubt. The Church, for example, affirms of her divine Lord and Head that He was "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified, dead, and buried, and that the third day He rose again from the dead," and how this Church hath received the same doctrine she makes plain beyond a peradventure by such language as she uses in the collect and proper preface for Christmas Day, and in those other formulas which she sets forth for our use in connection, *e.g.*, with the special offices for Good Friday, Easter Even, Easter, and Ascension Days, and the like. Whatever indefiniteness there may have been, or may seem to have been, in any particular article of the creeds, these other formularies, which are most surely a part of the doctrine and worship of this Church,—or else she has neither—must be accepted by any one dealing honestly with his ordination vows as explicitly interpreting them. And while even these do not shut out a certain latitude of construction, *e.g.*, as to the nature of the resurrection-body, concerning which a great deal of so-called Christian and Churchly teaching has been so grossly material as to make one wonder if those who were responsible for it had ever heard of chapter xv. of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians—yet, unless those formularies may rightfully be subjected to a treatment which any candid mind, unacquainted with theological controversies, would unhesitatingly pronounce to be utterly sophistical and disingenuous, they would seem to compel from those who are pledged to hold and teach them, so long as they are willing to remain so pledged, an assent and acceptance in that sense, and only in that sense, in which universally and without question, this Church hath received the same.

I know very well to what in this age we are indebted for a very different view of ecclesiastical formularies; and we are having just now a very interesting and suggestive illustration of the way in which the theological acumen of one school and of one generation may return in another to plague its authors, when once it has been adopted by their antagonists. Among the most significant and pregnant incidents in the theological history of this century was the publication by John Henry Newman of "Tract XC." As a method of dealing with questions of doctrine raised by the Thirty-nine Articles, it had certainly the distinction of novelty; for, turning aside from the question of the authority of the Articles, it raised the very different one of their construction, and it raised that question in order to show how they were susceptible of an interpretation of which it may with truth be said that it largely dismissed from those formularies the meaning which until then had been with practical unanimity popularly understood to be the reason for their existence. In other words, the Articles had been commonly supposed to be designed to set forth the essential distinction, in the matter of those doctrines of which they treated, between Anglican and Roman teaching. It remained for Dr. Newman to show to an astonished communion that the apparently contradictory positions of the two communions could be reconciled.

It was the remarkable intellectual feat of an extraordinary mind,—a mind of which a great archbishop who was contemporaneous with Newman wrote, many years afterward, "I have always regarded Newman as having a strange duality of mind. On the one side is a wonderfully strong and subtile reasoning faculty, on the other a . . . faith, ruled almost entirely by his emotions. It seems to me that, in all matters of belief, he first acts on his emotions, and then he brings the subtilty of his reason to bear, till he has ingeniously persuaded himself that he is logically right." *

But in Newman's case it did not take a great while for the brilliant author of Tract XC. to find that such methods as it illustrated brought with them no rest to a perplexed conscience; and the originator of them erelong withdrew from a ministry whose obligations he could no longer reconcile with the change in his own beliefs. It was the most honorable, as it was doubtless the most painful, act of his life.

But the results of a man's acts reach a great way beyond his practical repudiation of them; and to-day there are persons who never read Tract XC.—if they ever heard of it—who have come to regard it as an admitted principle that one may accept an ecclesiastical formula and maintain his position as an ecclesiastical teacher, under conditions in which he is largely engaged in employing his office, in order to read into formularies meanings which, in all the history of their development and formation, were wholly foreign to the minds of their compilers.

And this it is which has created in candid and ingenuous minds, whatever their religious beliefs, the gravest apprehensions. If it is supposed that these apprehensions are shared only by those who are tenaciously conservative of old and long-accepted beliefs, such an impression is quite beside the mark. There are a great many people today who are concerned not so much as to this or that belief as they are with the way in which its accepted guardians deal with it. A critic of public affairs, both civil and ecclesiastical, of exceptional ability, has lately said: "We do not need to say that all our sympathies are with the men in various communions who are open-minded enough to see how the new wine of modern research is hopelessly bursting the old ecclesiastical wine-skins. . . . One position, however, assumed by some persons of this class is . . . that a minister may honorably remain in the service of a Church, though repudiating leading articles of its creed. . . . It is acknowledged that no man rejecting the articles in question could obtain admission to the ministry of the particular body in the first instance. Still it is maintained that, once in, he may rightfully stay; in fact, that it is his duty to stay and reform the creed according to his notions. . . . The defence put forward for this position," continues the secular authority from which I am quoting, "will not bear examination. It consists, in the first place, in saying that it is monstrously absurd for the creed-makers of one age to bind the thinkers of the next. This is the worst form of the 'dead-hand' we are told. But all this is aside from the point. The 'dead-hand' system is a fact in ecclesiastical organizations, whether we like it or not. Its legal sanctions are admitted; that is unquestionable. It is the only way a communion has of maintaining its integrity. . . . And no man is called upon to submit himself to it with his eyes shut. The minister has the situation clearly put before him at his ordination, and accepts it. After thus deliberately accepting the 'dead-hand' system, what sort of a spectacle does a man present railing at its hardships? He has put the yoke on his own neck; if it galls, let him throw it off; but let him not deny the existence of the yoke. . . . If men belong to a Church which has officially and publicly declared that the historical symbols are not regarded seriously any longer, even though nominally retained, we must absolve the ministers, while condemning the Church. But if they have seriously accepted the creed of a religious body which continues to take its creed seriously; and think they can flout it while still serving under it, we can only say that the mass of men will regard that as an immoral thing to do."

---

* Life of Archbishop Tait, vol. i., p. 89.

I beg to remind you again, dear brethren, that these are the words of a purely secular observer of the present theological situation, given to the world in a purely secular organ of public opinion. I believe that they reflect the judgments of sober and honest minds with respect to the specific and exceptional obligations of the ministry in the matter of the Church's faith, not alone among ourselves but everywhere; and they do so because there are judgments and convictions imbedded in the moral consciousness of all honest men. In another hemisphere, a very eminent authority in the world of letters, looking at the same questions from another point of view, has lately said: "Supposing a trust fund had been created for the purpose of expounding the beauties of Wordsworth, should we quite approve of a lecturer who accepted the stipend and devoted a good deal of energy to the skilful depreciation of Wordsworth? . . . We believe that the ground idea of revelation is absolutely true, and has been the security for the only mental and moral freedom the race has enjoyed. And we must say that we think the opposite view, if it is to be urged with sincerity and consistency at all, should be urged by men who are not continually using liturgies which imply the very creeds they are denouncing, and offering up prayers which are pure mockeries unless God has really manifested Himself specially in Jewish history, and become incarnate in one human career equally majestic and submissive. Some day the close of this century will be described as the time when the heterodox thinkers began to fulminate against the orthodox, and Christians were almost treated as excommunicate, not because they believed less than they said, but because they did not regard their worship as a mere form of words of which the significance had to be carefully watered down until it became hardly significance at all." *

But it may be asked at this point, Is, then, one who is honestly perplexed concerning questions which touch the fundamental verities of the faith to stifle those perplexities, and to go on teaching or affirming as truth certain things concerning which he is no longer persuaded that they are the truth, but is rather, it may be, profoundly persuaded that they are not the truth? Is uniformity of teaching to be maintained at the cost of honest inquiry? Is a past pledge to bind a present conscience, whose old attitude to the thing once affirmed, it may have

---

* The Spectator, London, August 15, 1891.

been with the most absolute sincerity, is now wholly changed? Can any obligation of consistency warrant the maintenance of one attitude, outwardly, which is the expression of no inmost conviction?

These are entirely reasonable questions, but it is the misfortune of our time that, in the case of those who ask them, they are assumed to be susceptible of only one answer, and that an answer which justifies a line of action that accepts and uses the formulary in one breath and then, while retaining the office which imposes it, disowns its authority with the other. It would seem that by any candid mind dealing with the subject without predisposing prejudice, such a conclusion must be owned to be simply grotesque.

But what, then, it may be further demanded, is the duty of one in Holy Orders who cannot accept the faith, or conform to the order of the Church whose minister he is? Is he to throw up his commission, and retreat from his office, and abandon the communion of the Church of which he is a member? I am by no means prepared to say that any such constraint is laid upon him, or, if it is, that it is a course which should be resorted to, save as a last and most sorrowful extremity. But I am no less clear that in such a case, in the case, *e.g.* (for I have in this matter a strong desire to be as precise and specific as I can), of one who has parted with a faith in the supernatural element in the Holy Scriptures or in the person and work of Christ, it is the plain duty of such an one to suspend his ministrations, and temporarily, at any rate, to retire from the exercise of his sacred office, and address himself with prayer and abstinence, and most searching and candid inquiry, to an examination of the question or questions at issue. And I maintain, further, that it is pre-eminently his duty, at every step of such inquiry, to bring his impressions or conclusions to the bar of the Church's consistent and unvarying teaching, and to try and test what disturbs him by her clear voice, as that voice has spoken unfalteringly from the beginning. There is a large contempt in our time for patristic teaching, but we need not deify that teaching in order to demonstrate that, while much of it was undoubtedly local and temporary in its character, there runs through it consistently a clear stream of testimony to the person and work of Jesus Christ and to the divine order of the Holy Catholic Church, which no wise man will hastily disesteem.

But, if neither this nor any other voice can answer the questions or relieve the perplexities of such an one as I have imagined, then I am unable to see how honestly his work, his office and he can do otherwise than part company. It is of course competent to any one in the ministry of the Church, who may desire, from her councils or otherwise, an interpretation of her teachings, to ask for it; but so long as that teaching remains so plainly what it is, his liberty while in the ministry ends there. If any one among us thinks otherwise—if any class of men in Holy Orders shall ever be seen with one hand pulling down the very pillars of the temple, while with the other they are seeking to grasp every honor, dignity, and emolument which pertains to their office—and if the Church, whose servants they are, shall tolerate so monstrous an inconsistency, then one is compelled to say that the one and the other will equally deserve, even though they may not receive, the scorn and contempt of all honorable men. Again, let me say that I do not forget the ecclesiastical sophistry in which this very prevalent misconception began; but when it is considered that much that is heard in the way of a destructive criticism would have little or no weight were it not for the surroundings amid which it is uttered—and when it is further considered that the present is a situation which has almost more than any other given the enemy occasion to blaspheme, it cannot be wondered that it has provoked not alone profound grief and dismay, but also, and equally, a keen and righteous resentment!

But, dear brethren, we who would defend the Church's faith and order must see to it that in doing so we are not provoked to either extravagance or unreason. And it is my duty to say that just here at present there lies a great, if not our greatest, danger. It is characteristic of all periods of alarm that they exaggerate the proportions of the impending peril; and it is to be remembered that there are apt to be those who will not be slow to use such exaggerations in the interest of particular, and often very insufficiently authorized statements or definitions of the Church's teaching, in order to justify action which is equally intolerant and unjust. Let me indicate more explicitly what I mean. It is not uncommon nowadays, to hear the statement deliberately uttered that the minds of a large proportion of the clergy are honeycombed with error, and corrupted with false doctrines. It is by no means unusual to hear it affirmed that there is an equally prevalent disesteem for the order and ministry of the Church, as seen in the conduct of her services and the practice of her clergy.

Well, I presume that while I cannot at all venture to speak for those who are without my own jurisdiction, I may venture to speak for those who are within it. For much of the larger part of ten years, I have been constantly going in and out among them under conditions which I presume the great majority of them will bear me out in saying are conditions of considerable and habitual unreserve. If anybody knows what is going on in the parishes of the diocese of New York, whatever might be the adroitness of occasional or individual concealments, I presume that I do ; and I beg to say that such general imputations as I have referred to are absolutely and utterly unwarranted. Individual eccentricities, extravagances, irregularities, undoubtedly there are, and always will be. Occurring in and about a great centre, they will always attract notice and receive extensive and wholly gratuitous advertisement,—on which last, it may incidentally be observed, such things largely subsist. But it is one thing to note this or that extravagance or eccentricity, whether in teaching or worship, and quite another to treat it as in any wise representative, or other than the isolated and exceptional thing that it is. I remember very vividly the growing surprise with which, when I began going about in the diocese eight years ago, I took note of the almost universal conservatism both in doctrine and in order which I encountered. It is distinctly the prevalent note in our diocesan situation today, as I believe it to be in that American Church of which the diocese is a part.

The present is not, therefore, in my judgment, a time for alarm, much less is it a time for an illustration of that reactionary spirit, which in its almost passionate desire to cling to certain traditions that are purely the fruit of a very modern Protestantism forgets its Catholic heritage and its Catholic liberty. A very modern Protestantism, observe, I say, for I do not know anything that is more important for those who believe, as I certainly believe, that the Reformation contained something good, than to distinguish, for instance, in the matter of the authority of Holy Scripture, between the Protestantism of Milton and Luther, and that of their modern heirs who are in turn the inheritors of American Puritan theology. How far that theology has affected the minds of Churchmen (many of them the descendants of a Puritan ancestry) and has expressed itself in the teaching of our clergy in regard, *e.g.*, to the Bible, I should not like to undertake to say. But it is time that in that connection it was distinctly affirmed that the Bible includes both a human element and a divine element, and that it is entirely competent for any one in Holy Orders, whether bishop, priest or deacon, to say so, and if so, at any rate to inquire how the two elements may be distinguished and to avail himself of every adequate aid in the conduct of such an inquiry. There are those on the one hand who maintain that that literature which we call the Bible contains no divine element, and there are those on the other who maintain that it contains no human element. It is high time that it was said, and said with unmistakable explicitness, that neither of these positions is the position of the Church. If it is, then it behooves those who say so to point out where the Church has œcumenically said so. But as a matter of fact, as surely I need not remind those to whom I now speak, this is simply and utterly impossible. The Church has not anywhere. nor at any time committed herself to any dogmatic definition of the meaning of inspiration, and whatever particular sects or schools may have attempted to do in this direction is wholly aside from the question. Indeed, as has lately been forcibly pointed out, " it is remakable that Origen's almost reckless mysticism * and his accompanying repudiation of large parts of the narrative of the Old Testament and of some parts of the New, though it did not gain acceptance, and indeed had no right to it (for it had no sound basis) ; on the other hand never aroused the Church to contrary definitions. Nor is it only Origen who disputed the historical character of parts of the narrative of Holy Scripture. Clement before him in Alexandria, and the mediæval Anselm in the West, treat the seven days of creation as an allegory and not history. Athanasius speaks of paradise as ' a figure,' and a mediæval Greek writer, who had more of Irenæus than remains to us, declares that he did not know how those who kept to the letter and took the account of the Temptation historically rather than allegorically could meet the arguments of Irenæus against them.

" The Church, then, is not tied by any existing definition as to inspiration. We cannot make any exact claim upon any one's belief in regard to inspiration, simply because we have no authoritative definition to bring to bear upon him. Those of us who believe most in the inspiration of the Church will see a divine providence in this absence of dogma, because we shall perceive that only now is the state of knowledge such as admits of the question being legitimately raised." *

---

* Origen De Principiis, iv. 15, 16, 17.

And meantime, it ought to comfort those to whom its discussion is most alarming because so entirely unfamiliar, to be reminded that, after all, that which is the office of much of modern criticism that does not aim simply to be destructive, was equally the aim of those fathers of the Church whose teachings we are rightly enjoined ought to be had in reverence among us. "Thus St. Gregory of Nazianzus," as the writer whom I have already quoted points out, "speaking of God's dealings with the Jews of old, describes how, in order to gain the co-operation of man's good will in working for his recovery, He dealt after the manner of a school-master of a physician, and while curtailing part or their ancestral customs, tolerated the rest, making some concession to their tastes just as physicians make their medicines palatable that they may be taken by their patients. . . . Hence the first law, while it abolished their sacrifices, allowed them to be circumcised; then, when once they had accepted the removal of what was taken from them, they went further and gave up what had been conceded to them—in the first case, their sacrifices, and in the second their practice of circumcision—and they became instead of heathens, Jews, instead of Jews, Christians, being betrayed, as it were, by gradual changes into acceptance of the Gospel. Again St. Chrysostom explains how it is the very merit of the Old Testament that it has taught us to think things intolerable which under it were tolerated. 'Do not ask,' he says, 'how these Old Testament precepts can be good now when the need for them is past; ask how they were good when the period required them. Or, rather, if you wish, do inquire into their merit, even now. It is still conspicuous, and lies in nothing so much as what now enables us to find fault with them. Their highest praise is that we now see them to be defective.'" †

And plainly, if it was competent for patristic criticism thus to discriminate between the temporary and the permanent, the human and divine elements in the substance of Holy Scripture, it is competent for a reverent criticism to do the same thing as to the letter of it now. "Inspiration," it has pertinently been declared, "means the illumination of the judgment of the recorder." "By the contact of the Holy Spirit," says Origen, "they became clearer in their mental perception, and their souls were filled with a brighter light."* "But have we any reason," asks Mr. Gore, "to believe that inspiration means over and above this, the miraculous communication of facts not otherwise to be known, a miraculous communication such as would make the recorder independent of the ordinary processes of historical tradition? Certainly neither St. Luke's preface to his Gospel, nor the evidence of any inspired record justifies this assertion," and just as certainly "the Church repudiated the Montanist conception of inspiration according to which the inspired man speaks as the passive instrument of the Spirit;" to which it may be added, as pointed out by Epiphanius in an earlier age, and by Westcott and Mason in our own, that "metaphors which describe the Holy Spirit as acting upon a man 'like a flute player breathing into his flute,' or 'a plectrum striking a lyre,' have always a suspicion attaching to their use of heresy." †

And, if so, then another view of the Bible, at once more catholic and more defensible, cannot be denied to those who find in it their surest road to an intelligent and impregnable position with reference to the Holy Scripture. Nay more, it needs, I think, with much plainness to be said that those who are striving with a loyalty to Catholic tradition and with a tenderness and reverence for Holy Scripture, which is only greater than their tenderness and consideration for their fellow-believers, to find a basis of reconciliation between historic criticism and the inherited faith of the Church are doing a work for which they greatly deserve to be had in lasting and grateful remembrance. The want of our time, we are told, is for something which, amid the vagueness, the uncertainty, the contradictoriness of the thousand voices which assail us shall speak with definiteness. Yes, it is, but it is no less, nay, even more, I think, something which shall speak with discrimination. One of the small but courageous and reverent group of men to whom I have already referred observes with singular pertinency, just here, "In the truths which the Church teaches, we may distinguish two classes. First there are the central truths to which it bears absolute witness, such as the Fatherhood of God, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the redemption of all mankind, the origin and purpose of human life. These it teaches authoritatively. Its conduct is exactly analogous to a parent teaching the moral law to its children; teaching the commandments at first, till the child can be educated to understand the reason of them. So the Church says to her children, or to those who are seeking after truth, there is an absolute truth in religion as well as in morality; we have tested it; generations of the saints have found it true. It is a truth independent of individual teachers; independent of the shifting moods of opinion at any particular period, and you must accept it on our authority first. Further, these truths affect life, and they cannot be apprehended merely by the intellect. You must commit yourself to them; act upon them; there is a certain time when the seeker after truth sees where it lies; then it must cease to be an open question." You must, in the words of Tertullian, "seek till you find, but when you have once found truth, you must commit yourself to it." * You must believe that you may understand, but it is *that* you may understand! The dogma is authoritatively taught that the individual may be kept safe from mere individual caprice and fancifulness, but also that he himself may come to a rational understanding of his belief. No doubt the truth is so wide that, to the end of our lives, we shall still feel the need of guidance and of teaching. . . . Like St. Ignatius on his way to martyrdom, the Christian may feel at his dying day, "Now I begin to be a disciple," but the aim of the Church is to make each member have a rational hold upon his faith. When we are young we accept a doctrine because the Church teaches it to us; when we are grown up, we love the Church because it taught us the doctrine. "The Churchman," as Principal Hawkins has said in his sermons on the Church,† "never surrenders his individual responsibility. But he may and must surrender some portion at least of his independence and he benefits greatly by the surrender."

---

* Gore, The Holy Spirit and Inspiration, pp. 357, 358.

† Gregory Nazianzus, Orat. xxx. 25.

* Origen contra Celsum, vii. 4.

† Gore, Holy Spirit and Inspiration, p. 343.

"Submission to the authority of the Church is the merging of our mere individualism in the whole historic life of the great Christian brotherhood; it is making ourselves at one with the one religion in its most permanent and least mere local form. It is surrendering our individuality only to empty it of its narrowness." ‡

"Secondly, there are other truths which are rather deductions from these central points, or statements of them in accordance with the needs of the age; such as the mode of the relation of the divine and human nature in Christ, or free will, or predestination, or the method of the Atonement, or the nature of the inspiration of Holy Scripture. If, in any case, a point of this kind has consciously come before the whole Church and been reasoned out and been decided upon, such a decision raises it to the higher class of truths which are taught authoritatively: but if this is not so, the matter remains an open question. It remains a question for theologians, it is not imposed on individuals, though it may at any time become ripe for decision. The very fixity of the great central doctrines allows the Church to give a remarkable freedom to individual opinion on all other points. Practically, how much wider is the summary of the rule of faith as given in Irenæus (III. 4) or Tertullian (Præscr. 13) or Origen (De Principiis) or in the Apostles' or Nicene Creed, than the tests of orthodoxy that would be imposed in a modern religious circle!

St. Vincent of Perins is the great champion of antiquity as the test of truth, yet it is he who also insists on the duty of development, of growth, within the lines of the central truths. . . . "As the time goes on," he says, "it is right that the old truths should be elaborated, polished, filed down. . . . They should be made clear, have light thrown upon them, be marked off from each other, but they must not lose their fulness, their entirety, their essential character." *

"So it has happened in the course of the Christian history; doctrines like that of the Atonement have been restated afresh to meet the needs of the age. So it is happening still; doctrines like that of the method of creation, or the limits of inspiration, are still before the Church. The Church is slow to decide, to formulate, it stands aside, it reiterates its central truths, it says that whatever claims to be discovered must ultimately fit in with the central truths; Creation must remain God's work; the Bible must remain God's revelation of Himself; but for a time it is content to wait, loyal to fact, from whatever side it comes; confident alike in the many-sidedness and in the unity of the truth. While he accepts and while he searches, the Churchman can enjoy alike the inquiry of truth, which is the wooing of it, the knowledge of the truth which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, and all these together, says Lord Bacon* are the sovereign good of human nature." †

---

* Tertullian, Præscr. 9: *Quaerendum est donec inventus et credendum ubi inveneris.*

† Page 77.

‡ C. Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 51.

* St. Vincent of Lerins, Communitorium ix. and xxiii.

(2) And as of the Church's faith so of the Church's Order, and of the relation of those who are her ministers to the observance of that order. As to the institution of the order, government, and ministry of the Church, there has not in all ages been one opinion, nor is it likely that there ever will be. The language which in the Ordinal prefaces the offices of ordination declares that "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church — bishops, priests, and deacons: which offices were evermore held in such reverent estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same, and also by public prayer with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority."

You and I, dear brethren, most of us, know what we understand by these words and what may with strictest truth be said to have been the prevalent understanding of them in all ages of the Church. Despite the ridicule which has been widely cast upon the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession (a ridicule, it must be owned, often provoked by the arrogance of those pretensions which have too frequently accompanied it, and the want of Christian courtesy or charity with which its claims have been urged), the great mass of Churchmen, I am disposed to think, accept the authority of an apostolic ministry, with a due and substantially unbroken succession and continuity, as in accordance with the facts of history and the wants of men. They are not greatly disturbed by the crimes of popes, or the corruptions of councils. They have seen the power of the Church, in one part, if not in every part, to purge itself of error and to return humbly and reverently to the purity and simplicity of primitive doctrine and of primitive order. And as in nature one has seen the electric current overleap a break in the twisted wire along which it flashes, and fly onwards on its swift and enkindling errand, through further reaches of the same far-travelling agency, so they have seen the primitive and apostolic graces pierce their way through glooms of error and shame, and overleap the gaps in neglected order or discipline, and speed on those heavenly errands of healing and light on which the Church, Catholic and Apostolic, now as of old, is hastening. That those gifts and graces manifest themselves nowhere else and under no other conditions than within her fold, who are they that shall presume to affirm? "In those ever open portals" (of the kingdom of God) says Dr. Pusey in his "Responsibility of the Intellect in Matters of Faith"—"In those ever open portals there enter that countless multitude whom the Church knew not how to win, or, alas! neglected to win them." But the question is not whether within or without the Church, Catholic and apostolic both in its doctrine and ministry, there are the richest manifestations of divine grace or of human saintship. It is another and very different question that we have to deal with—a very dry and uninteresting, because largely unintelligible question, to multitudes of exemplary people (and that simply because they have never chosen to see it in its relation to the revealed mind and ordering of the Head of the Church in the matter of the foundations of a Christian society), and that is the question whether the ministry has not always "advanced upon the principle of succession, so that whatever functions a man held at any time were simply those that had been committed to him by some one among his predecessors who held the authority to give orders by regular devolution from the apostles." *

There are many of us, and I am quite free to say that I find myself among them, who are quite sufficiently clear for all practical purposes on this point. "It was," says Stanton in his work on the Christian Ministry historically considered, "a law, as it were, of the being of the Church that it should put on this (the three-fold or episcopal) form of organization—a law which worked as surely as the growth of a particular kind of plant from a particular kind of seed. Everywhere there was a development which made unerringly for the same good. This seems to speak of divine institution almost as plainly as if our Lord had in so many words prescribed this form of Church government. He, the Founder, the Creator of the Church, would seem to have impressed upon it this nature."

Says Mr. Gore, referring to this language, "Mr. Darwin, writing about his theory of the process of evolution in nature, uses these words, 'I fully admit that there are very many difficulties not satisfactorily explained by my theory of descent with modification; but I cannot possibly believe that a false theory would explain so many classes of facts as I think it certainly does explain. On these grounds I drop my anchor, and believe that the difficulties will slowly disappear.'"* "It is interesting to notice," continues Mr. Gore, "what grounds of evidence a great scientific teacher thinks adequate to support a far-reaching doctrine; and it is impossible not to perceive what infinitely higher grounds we have for our theory of the Apostolic Succession. It not only explains many classes of facts, but it, and it only (though of course the cogency of the positive evidence for it is different at different stages), appears to explain all the phenomena of the Christian ministry from the beginning. We, then, have better cause to drop our anchor."† For one, I profoundly believe that we have, and I am glad of the opportunity to relieve the possible apprehensions of some perturbed brethren by saying so.

---

* Bacon, Essay on Truth.

† The Rev. Walter Locke, The Church, pp. 387–9.

* Gore, The Christian Ministry, p. 343.

But when I have, there is something more that still remains to be said. There is a view of the ministry which is held by some of the clergy and by more, I presume, of the laity of this Church, which is quite a different one. It explains its three-fold character as the result of circumstances,—providential circumstances most surely, since, as a matter of fact, to a Christian mind there can be no other,—rather than as a matter of specific divine purpose and institution. It holds the episcopate to be necessary indeed to the completeness of the Church but not, certainly, to its existence; or, to put it in a familiar way, as necessary to its well-being, but not, absolutely, to its being. It holds the episcopate to be distinguishable from the presbyterate, rather by a law of convenience than by any higher law. And it carries out these opinions more or less explicitly to their logical conclusions, in its judgments of the divisions of Christendom, and in its relations to those who represent them.

I am not one of those who have been able to find in such views any sufficient warrant in Holy Scripture or in Christian history; and I am quite free to say that the latest effort to enforce them in the very able and brilliant lectures of Dr. Hatch seems to me to involve the grave peril of proving a great deal too much. It is difficult, in other words, to see how an argument which derives the organic form of the Church from the coincidence of local circumstances, and largely, if not completely, eliminates the element of a divine and prevenient ordering and purpose, might not with equal appropriateness be applied not merely to questions of order but to questions of doctrine. But, on the other hand, that it is not competent for one in Holy Orders in this Church to hold and affirm views of the origin and character of its three-fold ministry such as I have just indicated, can only be alleged of one who is grossly ignorant, whether of the history of the Church of England or of our own, or deliberately determined to misrepresent both. The effort which we have lately seen in this Church to defeat the confirmation of an eminent presbyter elected to the episcopate, and to defeat it by methods which, in the judgment of all decent people, ought to redound to the lasting dishonor of those who employ them, was an effort ostensibly to compass that defeat on grounds of theological unsoundness, but really, so far as it had any respectable championship, because the individual concerned did not happen to hold a prevalent view of the Apostolic Succession. It does not seem to have occurred to such persons that a different view was long held by the venerated and saintly man who was, for the first fifty years of its history, the presiding bishop of this Church, and that William White was by no means the only presiding bishop that held such a view. It seems quite as little to have occurred to them that, if such a view be a positive disqualification for the episcopate, it would have excluded scores of men from the House of Bishops, some of whom have lent to it much the noblest lustre with which it has ever shone. It does not seem to have occurred to them, either, that what is true of the American is quite as true of the Anglican Church. Least of all does it seem to have occurred to them that this endeavor to force the view of one party or school as a finality upon the whole Church is simply so much partisan insolence. But it is high time that at least that much did occur to them! We may regret, dear brethren, as I am quite free to say I do, that any man called to a high and sacred office does not see its sanctions and trace its authority along the lines that seem so clear to us. But an intelligent recognition of the relations of the clergy to questions of ecclesiastical order in our time demands that we must recognize the liberty, as well as the limitations, which pertain to every man among them.

And here I desire to say that I do not forget those limitations as they are indicated in the canonical legislation of this Church, and that I am glad of the opportunity to say to the clergy of this diocese that the Church's law in this particular is on the whole, in my judgment, both wise and timely. That law, as you will remember, is stated in Canon 14 and in Canon 22 of Title I. of the Digest, and its object, plainly enough, is to protect the people committed to our charge from unauthorized or erroneous teaching. Undoubtedly there are times when its rigid application may seem to some of us to deny to Church people too much, and to deprive us of the edification of teachers who make no claim to hold the orders of this Church, but who have nevertheless won wide and respectful recognition as being in the true spiritual succession of the prophets of an elder time. I can very well understand that feeling, though I have never at any period in my own ministry found myself seriously tempted to yield to it, being persuaded, I must own, that it was open to the suspicion of being of scant courtesy to those to whom it seemed to extend courtesy, and,—quite apart from the question of its canonical irregularity,—of doubtful edification to those for whose benefit it was designed. I can very well understand, also, how, for example, the spectacle of the appearance of one who made no claim to any ministerial ordination or commission whatever, and whose fellowship denied to all infants the saving grace of Holy Baptism, as a public teacher, in the cathedral church of another diocese than our own, might create a good deal of confusion in the minds of well-meaning and kindly disposed clergy, eager to reach out a brotherly hand to Christians of other names around us. But even a spectacle resembling this, sporadic, exceptional, and wholly unlikely to provoke general or even occasional imitation, has not seemed to me a sufficient reason for invoking the penalties of the law of the Church,—even if I could persuade myself that as the judge in these matters of my brethren it could ever be my duty to set the Church's penal machinery in motion.

---

* Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, II., p. 217.

† Gore, The Christian Ministry, pp. 343–4.

If, however, in this I shall hereafter see reason—as I have not yet seen—to believe myself mistaken, it is proper that I should say here publicly, what I have had occasion already to say privately, that if the prohibitions of Canon 14 of Title I. are to be invoked in one direction, they could not with any propriety be withheld from application in another. We have had Greeks and Armenians and Old Catholics, not only preaching from the pulpits, but celebrating at the altars of some of our most venerable churches and chapels. No one of these persons was "licensed or ordained according to" our canons, nor were all of them (as, for example, those of the Greek or Russian Church) in any sense "communicants of this Church." Nay, more, the hospitable and charitable invitations to those persons to perform their services in our sanctuaries, —invitations which the Catholic heart of the whole Church has applauded, fall, and that by the strictest and most liberal construction, within the express prohibitions, not of one, but of two, canons of the Church. Such ecclesiastics were not, as I have said, "licensed or ordained to minister in this Church," and, unhappily, they could not be called "communicants of this Church," yet they were invited to "officiate" and "minister" in unequivocal "acts of sacerdotal function,"—and not only so, but, "in performing such service" they were expected and intended to use "other prayers than those prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer." I do not see how, under a rigid rule of construction, the conclusion can be avoided that these most charitable invitations were in direct contravention of the plain prohibitions of Canon 14 of Title I. and also of Section 1 of Canon 22 of the same Title. And it must be obvious that, if the penal machinery of the Church is to be set in operation for the punishment of one class of offences, under the canons above referred to, it cannot stop this side of its application to another (and in one aspect of them) more flagrant set of offences under the same canons, simply because they who have invoked the canon do not wish it to punish offenders with whom they themselves happen to be in sympathy.

Nay, more, dear brethren, it is my duty to remind you that all these things belong to a still larger class of things done by the clergy of various schools and tendencies, which men of other schools hold to be contrary to the plain order of this Church, and which undoubtedly are thus contrary. Obviously, if we are to enter upon a course of discipline toward one class, we must not linger to initiate it toward another, and, just as plainly, we must persist in attempting to accomplish by the application of penal discipline what, in the long run, can only be accomplished by lifting the standard of personal loyalty and deepening in the individual consciences of the clergy a reverence for the Church's voice of authority.

But in saying this let me not be misunderstood. It is commonly supposed,—at least I am often told so,—that I am keenly averse to ecclesiastical trials among us. I am quite free to say that, under the present law of this Church, I shall very reluctantly initiate one, for I confess that to expect, as in some aspects of our present canons they seem to, that the Ordinary shall serve as grand jury, prosecuting attorney, and judge, all in one, is simply a legal absurdity. But if the clergy want their brethren tried, let me say plainly that they must be willing in each case to get behind the indictment and shoulder the responsibility of bringing accusations,—accusations which too many of them are ready enough to repeat, but a little more ready to disown when explicitly they are called to account for them. When they do that, they will discover, as some of them have already discovered, that the machinery of the law will be set in motion quite as promptly as they could desire.

But indeed, as I have already implied, whether it is or not, is, as our canon law stands at present, a matter of very little consequence. When a diocesan court has done its utmost to punish an offender, it is only a diocesan court after all. What is heterodoxy to-day in one jurisdiction may be pronounced by some other court in another to be orthodoxy to-morrow; and until the Church provides some ultimate Court of Appeal in matters of Faith and Order, diocesan decisions upon either point will absolutely determine nothing.

"Very well, then," it may be said, "if the law cannot help us, there is left at least the refuge of petition, of protest, of remonstrance. Yes, and it is a most sacred refuge. Palsied be the hand that would seek to rob even the feeblest of us of it! But when it is invoked it would be well, as I think you will agree with me, that it should be so employed as at least to seem to recognize the simplest laws of courtesy. It is not my purpose here to speak of the contents of a certain remonstrance signed by some of the clergy of this diocese last spring, simply because the history of the whole business makes that impossible. I am not, I think it will be owned, a stickler for official prerogatives, and I fancy there are very few persons in the episcopal office who are accustomed to treat such questions with more profound indifference, — an indifference which I have lately had occasion to apprehend has led some persons to suppose that they need not consider the ordinary and reasonable civilities of either personal or official intercourse. It is the first time, I apprehend, in the history of this Church, that a bishop has come to know of the contents of a communication addressed exclusively to himself, by finding it in the columns of a newspaper, and it will be the only time, I hope, in the history of the Church that a bishop's only information of such a communication shall be of so irresponsible a nature. Indeed, I cannot suppose that any clergyman or any body of clergymen could otherwise than very hastily imagine that a bishop could consent to take notice of a document authenticated to him, not only by no responsible signature, but by no signature whatever. "I find it sometimes easier," said a great French archbishop, "to make my clergy proficient in theology than in filial and fraternal courtesy." I am glad to believe, dear brethren, that in these latter graces no one of us would willingly be deficient.

But in the matter of the relations of the clergy to the faith and order of the Church there is one thing in which we all need instruction, and with a reference to that, I may well close this discussion. It is a very natural instinct of human nature, and it has been, alas, a very pre-eminent distinction of people who have supremely arrogated to themselves the title of theologians to crush out opinions that, upon whatever question, do not happen to accord with their own. But it is an instinct as ignoble as it is common, and, more than that, it is one the triumph of which would be scarcely less fatal to the true life and growth of the Church than the widest prevalence of error. In a body which, while, as we rejoice to believe, under divine guidance and inspiration, is still made up of very frail and faulty members, led by very fallible and often very imperfectly formed guides, no graver or more perilous situation could come to pass than that in which the due proportion of the faith and the due balance of opposite aspects of the one truth were no longer maintained by the differing and sometimes apparently dissonant voices of its teachers. The moment that we have affirmed the one truth we are bound to affirm that there are, and rightly ought to be, various standpoints from which to look at it. There are those to whom, constitutionally, such a statement is intolerable; but that does not alter the fact. And, because it is the fact, the Church's duty in our time is clear. We want defenders of the Church's liberty, as well as of the Church's orthodoxy, and we want on this point, on the part of the episcopate, a candor in leadership which honest men have, from those who are over them, a right to look for. There is a divine doctrine, but let us take care that in defining it we do not make it narrower than Christ Himself has made it! There is a divine order, but let us not seek only so inexorably to enforce it that, like those iron images of the middle ages, it shall crush the life out of the victim whom it embraces. The question for us who are ministers of this Church is how the two sides of its truth are to be united in that kind of Churchmanship which shall stand for all the sanctities of the individual soul in the sanctity of the Church itself, as the very institution of sacredness,—holy in its government, in its rites, in its creeds, because only in and by these can the very idea of holiness, or wholeness, be maintained ; and therefore, insisting on this supreme holiness in its unity, its hierarchy, its worship, and its faith, while never losing sight of the fact that the ground of all holiness is in reason, and that reason must be respected in its freedom, lest truth shall be untruly believed, and loyalty be disloyally given, and worship be paid by an unworshipping heart. Authority is not its own end. Parentage is not for the sake of parentage. The end of parentage is that the child may be a man. The end of authority is spiritual freedom. To-day the Church and civilization by the Church have reached the period where the child is nearing manhood, where authority must justify itself, where the reason of man must find itself in the reason of the Church, and so feel free while obeying that reason as, in the truest sense, its own. . . . Authority and reason, order and freedom, spirit and form, this is the true definition of the Catholic Church, and of the Churchmanship which our times want—because all times want it ! Under the dominion of such a spirit self-will will distrust itself, and the reason of one be qualified and ennobled by the larger reason of the whole ; and under it most of all, our ministry—yours and mine, my reverend brethren—will become a ministry of reconciliation, reconciling the past and the present, the Church and the individual ; the soul and God. May God hasten that day !

PROOFS OF AN HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

BY WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY, D.D., OXON.
BISHOP OF IOWA AND PRESIDENT OF GRISWOLD COLLEGE, DAVENPORT.

From the *Iowa Churchman* (Epis.), Davenport, Iowa, September and October, 1891.

THE critical examination of the New Testament writings for notices of the polity of the apostolic churches plainly indicates that the ultimate earthly authority there recognized was that exercised by the Apostles, and that the means for the transmission of this authority was by the imposition of apostolic hands. In other words, the principle of individual overseership, or episcopacy, exercised by the Apostles first and by apostolic delegates afterward, and gradually taking shape in more easily recognized and definite form, *is* found in the New Testament scriptures, while we may search their pages in vain for any indication of the principle of Presbyterian parity or of Congregational democracy. Few and scattered as are the New Testament allusions to the polity of the Church in the days in which the Apostles were still present on the earth, the trend of each and all of these passages is evident. The source of power in the Church was not from the people or of the people. It was from above ; and in these scanty notices we see apostolic rule gradually merging into episcopal authority and power.

The exercise of the commission of their Master—" As the Father hath sent me even so send I you,"—by the Twelve, chosen not by the company of believers but by the Lord Himself ; the solemn investiture of Matthias, not by the people, but by the Eleven acting under divine guidance, with the office from which Judas fell ; the choice of the great Apostle to the Gentiles by the great Head of the Church Himself—" an apostle not from men neither through men, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father ;" [*] the headship of the Church at Jerusalem as well as the title of " Apostle," so plainly accorded by St. Paul to " James, the Lord's brother," who was evidently not one of the Twelve ; the absence of any hint that the apostolate was to be limited to the Twelve, and on the other hand the application of the title to Barnabas,[†] to Andronicus and Junias,[‡] probably to Sylvanus [§] and to others by St. Paul; the condemnation of "false apostles;" the committal by St. Paul of the charge of the churches he had founded to Timothy and Titus; the latest messages of the head of the Church, not to the people but to the rulers, the "angels," the individually-responsible heads of the apocalyptic churches; these are each and all part of that vast network of scriptural testimony uniting with its countless meshes the Church's Chief Shepherd and Bishop of Souls with the threefold ministry and the polity which, ere the death of the last of the Apostles, St. John, was universally established throughout the Church of Christ.

---

[*] Galatians i. 1.

[†] " The apostleship of Barnabas is beyond question. St. Luke records his consecration to the office as taking place at the same time with, and in the same manner as, St. Paul's (Acts xiii 2, 3). In his account of their missionary labors he again names them together as ' Apostles,' even mentioning Barnabas first (Acts xiv. 4, 14). St. Paul himself also in two different epistles uses similar language. In the Galatian letter he speaks of Barnabas as associated with himself in the apostleship of the Gentiles (ii. 9) ; in the First to the Corinthians he claims for his fellow-laborer all the privileges of an Apostle, as one who, like himself, holds the office of an Apostle and is doing the work of an Apostle (ix. 5, 6). If, therefore, St. Paul has held a larger place than Barnabas in the gratitude and veneration of the Church of all ages, this is due not to any superiority of rank or office, but to the ascendancy of his personal gifts, a more intense energy and self-devotion, wider and deeper sympathies, a firmer intellectual grasp, a larger measure of the spirit of Christ."—Bp. Lightfoot's *Epis. to the Galatians*, pp. 96, 97.

[‡] "On the most natural interpretation of a passage in the Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 7), Andronicus and Junias, two Christians otherwise unknown to us, are called distinguished members of the apostolate, language which indirectly implies a very considerable extension of the term."—Ibid., p. 95.

[§] " In 1 Thess. ii. 6, again, where . . he speaks of the disinterested labors of himself and his colleagues, adding

It is the judgment of the great Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, whose recent death all good men deplore, that "history seems to show decisively that before the middle of the second century each Church or organized Christian community had its three orders of ministers, its bishop, its presbyters, and its deacons. On this point there cannot reasonably be two opinions." [*] The same distinguished scholar, in commenting on the position occupied by St. James, the brother of the Lord, in the Church of Jerusalem, after expressing his conviction that "he was not one of the Twelve," asserts that "the episcopal office thus existed in the mother church of Jerusalem from very early days, at least in a rudimentary form;" [†] while the government of the Gentile churches, though presenting no distinct traces of a similar organization, exhibits "stages of development tending in this direction." [‡] Lightfoot, who discusses this subject with singular moderation and fairness, concedes that the position occupied by Timothy and Titus, whom he styles "apostolic delegates," "fairly represents the functions of the bishop early in the second century." [§] Even admitting with Lightfoot that "James the Lord's brother alone, within the period compassed by the apostolic writings, can claim to be regarded as a bishop in the later and more special sense of the term," and that "as late, therefore, as the year 70 no distinct signs of episcopal government have appeared in Gentile Christendom," still it must be acknowledged, in the language of the same authority, that "unless we have recourse to a sweeping condemnation of received documents, it seems vain to deny that early in the second century the episcopal office was firmly and widely established. Thus, during the last three decades of the first century, and consequently during the lifetime of the latest surviving Apostle, this change must have been brought about." [*] Again and again does this great scholar refer to the fact of the early and general establishment of episcopacy "from the Apostles' times." For example, he asserts that "the evidence for the early and wide extension of episcopacy throughout proconsular Asia, the scene of St. John's latest labors, may be considered irrefragable." [†] And again, "these notices, besides establishing the general prevalence of episcopacy . . . establish this result clearly, that its maturer forms are seen first in those regions where the latest surviving Apostles, more especially St. John, fixed their abode, and at a time when its prevalence cannot be dissociated from their influence or their sanction." [‡]

And again, "It has been seen that the institution of an episcopate must be placed as far back as the closing years of the first century, and that it cannot, without violence to historical testimony, be dissevered from the name of St. John." [§] "It will appear," continues Lightfoot, "that the pressing needs of the Church were mainly instrumental in bringing about this result; and that this development of the episcopal office was a providential safeguard amid the confusion of speculative opinion, the distracting effects of persecution, and the growing anarchy of social life, which threatened not only the extension but the very existence of the Church of Christ." [‖] With this cumulative presentation of the proofs of the historic episcopate from the writings of the leading scholar of the age, we may be prepared for the Bishop's summing up of the whole matter among the closing words of his *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry:* "If the preceding investigation is substantially correct, the threefold ministry can be traced to apostolic direction; and short of an express statement we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment, or at least a Divine sanction." [‖] In even stronger language this great scholar, in his sermon before the Wolverhampton Church Congress, asserts that the Church of England has "retained a form of church government which had been handed down in unbroken continuity from the Apostles' times."

With these statements and these proofs the language of the Ordinal of the Book of

---

'though *we* might have been burdensome to you, being Apostles of Christ,' it is probable that under this term he includes Sylvanus, who had labored with him in Thessalonica, and whose name appears in the superscription of the letter."—Ibid.

[*] Bp. Lightfoot's *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*, appended to his *Commentary on the Philippians*, p. 184.

[†] Lightfoot's *Christian Ministry*, p. 196.

[‡] Ibid.

[§] Ibid., p. 197.

[*] Lightfoot's *Christian Ministry*, p. 199.

[†] Ibid., p. 212.

[‡] Ibid., pp. 225, 226.

[§] Ibid., p. 232.

[‖] Ibid., p. 265.

Common Prayer is in strict accord. "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church — bishops, priests and deacons." The full meaning of this statement appears in the fact that it is the requirement of the canon law of the Church as well as of the Ordinal that "no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had episcopal consecration or ordination." In the judgment of Lightfoot, as evidently in the intention of the Ordinal, the "historic episcopate" includes the apostolic succession—the threefold ministry communicated by the imposition of hands and continued "in unbroken continuity from the Apostles' times."

To quote the language of Mr. Gladstone, "In the latter part of the second century of the Christian era, the subject," of the Apostolic Succession "came into distinct and formal view; and from that time forward it seems to have been considered by the great writers of the Catholic body, a fact too palpable to be doubted, and too simple to be misunderstood." *

We have thus far dealt merely with the proofs of the historic episcopate as indicated in the New Testament and as existing during the lifetime of St. John. We turn to the witness of history to the fact that our Lord instituted in His Church, by succession from the Apostles, a threefold ministry, the highest order of these ministers alone having the authority and power to perpetuate this ministry by the laying on of hands.

The Church of Jerusalem, the mother of us all, as we have already seen, presents the earliest instance of a bishop in the sense in which the word was understood in post-apostolic times. The rule and official prominence of St. James, "the Lord's brother," is recognized both in the epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles. That which is so plainly indicated in the canonical Scriptures is supported by the uniform tradition of the succeeding age. On the death of St. James, which took place immediately before the war of Vespasian, Symeon succeeded to his place and rule. Hegisippus, who is our authority for this statement, and who represents Symeon as holding the same office with St. James and with equal distinctness styles him a bishop, was doubtless born ere Symeon died. Eusebius gives us a list of Symeon's successors. In less than thirty years,—such were the troubles and uncertainties of the times,—there appear to have been thirty occupants of the see. On the building of Ælia Capitolina on the ruins of Jerusalem, Marcus presided over the Church in the Holy City as its first Gentile bishop; Narcissus, who became Bishop of Jerusalem in the year 190, is referred to by Alexander, in whose favor he resigned his see in the year 214, as still living at the age of 116—thus in this single instance bridging over the period from the time when the Apostle John was still living to the date when, by universal consent, it is conceded that episcopacy was established in all quarters of the world.

Passing from the mother Church of Jerusalem to Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians, and which may be regarded as the natural centre of Gentile Christianity, we find from tradition that Antioch received its first bishop from St. Peter. We need not discuss the probabilities of this story, since there can be no doubt as to the name standing second on the list. Ignatius is mentioned as a bishop by the earliest authors. His own language is conclusive as to his own conviction on this point. He writes to one bishop, Polycarp. He refers by name to another, Onesimus. He contemplates the appointment of his successor at Antioch after his decease. The successor whose appointment Ignatius anticipated is said by Eusebius to have been Hero, and from his episcopate the list of Antiochene bishops is complete. If the authenticity of the entire catalogue is questionable, two bishops of Antioch at least, during the second century, Theophilus and Serapion, are confessedly historical personages. With reference to the Epistles of Ignatius, controversy has raged for centuries. Their outspoken testimony in favor of episcopacy has been regarded by the advocates of parity or of independency as a proof of their want of authenticity. But the discussion has been practically settled in our own day, and the judgment of Lightfoot, the latest and greatest commentator on these interesting remains of Christian antiquity, will be received without question by all whose opinion is worthy of consideration. He places these epistles among the earliest years of the second century, and he regards the testimony of Ignatius to the existence and universality of the threefold ministry at the period in which he lived and wrote as conclusive. The celebrated Ger-

---

* *Church Principles Considered in their Results*, by W. E. Gladstone; p. 189.

man critic and scholar, Dr. Harnack, who characterizes Lightfoot's work as "the most learned and careful patristic monograph of the century," accepts the conclusions of the bishop and concedes that the genuineness of the Ignatian letters is rendered "certain." With such a witness, thus supported by scholars confessedly occupying the foremost place for learning and critical power, we may proceed to details.

In the Ignatian Letters, the writer, the second Bishop of Antioch, appears as a condemned prisoner travelling through Asia to his martyrdom at Rome. Though each step of his progress brought him nearer to death; though the severity of his guard, "a maniple of ten soldiers," whom he designates as "leopards," makes his last days wretchedly uncomfortable, still his journey is a triumph. On his arrival at Smyrna, representatives of the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia and Tralles unite with the flock of Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna, to do him honor. During his stay at Smyrna the aged bishop addresses four of his extant epistles to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, and to the Romans. The remaining three epistles, those to the Churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna and to Polycarp its Bishop, were written from Troas whither a deacon from Ephesus had borne him company. The saint proceeds from Neapolis to Philippi, where he is welcomed by the Church and escorted on his way, and thus he goes toward Rome. Though, in his modesty, choosing to speak of himself as "only now beginning to be a disciple," the nearness to the end evidently bringing to him new revelations of spiritual things and the life to come, he acts and writes as a man advanced in years. Doubtless he was near to man's estate when the great Apostle wrote his epistles. He must have been in full maturity when Jerusalem was trodden under foot of the Gentiles and the Church was driven from its cradle-home. He in whose life all this had transpired was now on his way to death. He fully realized that the end was near at hand. His days were numbered, and in his epistles he appears to have sought to crowd counsels of the highest moment, the dying legacy of one whose voice would soon be forever hushed in death. The points this aged saint chiefly dwells upon are two—the doctrine of the Incarnation as an historic fact, as perpetuated in sacraments, as a fundamental principle of the faith; and the threefold ministry, the divinely given rule for the Church, by which the Church itself would be recognized, and the religion of the Christ made known as something organic, real, lasting, disciplined.

In his statements of the prerogative of the threefold ministry, Ignatius is emphatic. "It is meet, therefore, . . . that being perfectly joined together in one submission, submitting yourselves to your bishop and presbytery, ye may be sanctified in all things." * "I was forward to exhort you, that ye run in harmony with the mind of God; for Jesus Christ also, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, even as the bishops that are settled in the farthest parts of the earth are in the mind of Jesus Christ. So then it becometh you to run in harmony with the mind of the bishop, which thing also ye do. For your honorable presbytery, which is worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop, even as its strings to a lyre." †

"Let no man be deceived. If any one be not within the precinct of the altar, he lacketh the bread [of God]. For, if the prayer of one and another hath so great force, how much more that of the bishop and of the whole church. . . . Let us therefore be careful not to resist the bishop, that by our submission we may give ourselves to God. And in proportion as a man seeth that his bishop is silent, let him fear him the more. For every one whom the Master of the household sendeth to be steward over his own house, we ought so to receive as Him that sent him. Plainly, therefore, we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself." ‡

"Assemble yourselves together . . . to the end that ye may obey the bishop and the presbytery without distraction of mind; breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote that we should not die." §

"Forasmuch, then, as I was permitted to see you in the person of your godly bishop, Damas, and your worthy presbyters, Bassus and Apollonius, and my fellow-servant the deacon, Sotion, of whom I would fain have joy, for that he is subject to the bishop as unto the grace of God, and to the presbytery as unto the law of Jesus Christ. Yea, and it becometh you also not to presume upon the youth of your bishop, but according to the power of God the Father to render unto him all reverence, . . . yet not to him but to the Father of Jesus Christ, even to the bishop of all. . . . For a man does not so much deceive this bishop, who is seen, as cheat that other who is invisible." ‖

---

* Ad Eph., 2. In our citations we avail ourselves of Bp. Lightfoot's translation.

† Ibid., 3, 4. Lightfoot's translation.

‡ Ibid., 5, 6.

§ Ibid., 20.

‖ Ad. Magn., 2, 3.

"Be ye zealous to do all things in godly concord, the bishop presiding after the likeness of God, and the presbyters after the likeness of the council of the apostles, with the deacons also who are most dear to me, having been entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ." *

"As the Lord did nothing without the Father, either by Himself or by the apostles, so neither do ye anything without the bishop and the presbyters." †

"Be obedient to the bishop, and to one another, as Jesus Christ was to the Father." ‡

"When ye are obedient to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, it is evident to me that ye are living not after men but after Jesus Christ. . . . It is therefore necessary, even as your wont is, that you should do nothing without the bishop ; but be ye obedient also to the presbytery, as to the apostles. . . . And those likewise who are deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ must please all men in all ways. . . . In like manner let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the Bishop as being a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a Church." §

"This will surely be, if ye be not puffed up, and if ye be inseparable from [God] Jesus Christ, and from the ordinances of the apostles. He that is within the sanctuary is clean, but he that is without the sanctuary is not clean ; that is, he that doeth aught without the bishop and presbytery and deacons, this man is not clean in his conscience." ‖

"Fare ye well in Jesus Christ, committing yourselves to the bishop as to the commandment, and likewise also to the presbytery." ¶.

"For as many as are of God and of Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop ; and as many as shall repent and enter into the unity of the Church, these also shall be of God. . . . Be ye careful, therefore, to observe one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union in His blood ; there is one altar as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow-servants." **

"Shun divisions as the beginning of evils. Do ye all follow your bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the apostles ; and to the deacons pay respect, as to God's commandment. Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Church apart from the Bishop. Let that be held a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop, or one to whom he shall have committed it. Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be ; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church. It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast, but whatever he shall approve ; this is well-pleasing also to God, that everything which ye do may be sure and valid." *

"It is good to recognize God and the bishop. He that honoreth the bishop is honored of God. He that doeth aught without the knowledge of the bishop rendereth service to the devil." †

There can be no question that the writer of these extracts held clear and well-defined views both as to the existence of a visible, organized Church of Christ, and a threefold, divinely authorized ministry ruling that Church. This he deems to be the "mind of God ;" this is "the commandment ;" and so fully does he hold this view that in his dying counsels he emphasized the idea that he who would keep the "commandment" and run in accord with the divine mind must lose sight of his very individuality in the fellowship of the Church, and unhesitatingly and without reserve submit himself in action, word, or purpose to the divinely appointed rule and order of the Church. Nor is this all. He regards the threefold ministry as essential to the very being of the Church ; for, to quote his own words, as rendered by Lightfoot, "without these three orders no Church has a title to the name." ‡ This hierarchy, this monarchical episcopate, the aged bishop of Antioch regards as "firmly rooted," as "beyond dispute," and as coextensive with the Church. He speaks of bishops as established in "the farthest parts of the earth," § and it is evident from his language that, in his judgment, the episcopate is not an evolution from the presbyterate, but is from above, the ordering of God Himself.

To these words of Ignatius, so clear, so strong, so abundant, we turn to the testimony of Irenæus, who was born not later than A.D. 130. He asserts that in his youth he sat at the feet of Polycarp, who had been appointed by the apostles a bishop for Asia in the Church of Smyrna, and that he had listened to the discourses in public and private of this venerable man, whose very looks and ways, he assures us, were indelibly impressed upon his mind. Irenæus further claims that he had opportunities of instruction from Asiatic "elders," some of whom, he tells us, had been disciples of the apostles. With these means of learning the traditions of the Church in Asia Minor, as shaped by no less an authority than St. John himself, the latest living of the apostolic band, Irenæus, while yet a young man and probably prior to Polycarp's martyrdom (*circa* A.D. 155), removed from Asia to Rome. At the latest, in the year 177, when persecution visited the churches of southern Gaul, Irenæus was a presbyter of Lyons, and was elevated to the see of the martyred bishop Pothinus. There is record of his visiting Rome prior to his entrance upon the episcopal office as well as afterward ; his object in each case being to promote the peace of the Church. Thus fitted by circumstances as well as by his character to know and maintain the "traditions of the elders," we find in his writings, to quote the language of the latest authority on this subject, Mr. Charles Gore, in his work on "The Ministry of the Christian Church," "the picture of the universal Church, spread all over the world, handing down in unbroken succession the apostolic truth ; and the bound of unity, the link to connect the generations in the Church, is the episcopal succession." *

---

* Ad. Magn., 6. † Ibid., 7. ‡ Ibid,, 13. § Ad. Trall., 2, 3. ‖ Ibid, 7. ¶ Ibid., 13. ** Ad. Philad., 3, 4.

* Ad. Smyrn., 8. † Ibid., 9. ‡ Ad. Trall., 3. § Ad. Eph., 3.

The language of Irenæus is clear and determinate with reference to the succession of the bishops to the authority and rule exercised by the apostles in the Church, and "because it would be tedious . . . to enumerate the succession of all the Churches," he gives that of the Church of Rome, and records the committal of the episcopate by the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul to Linus (A.D. 68), and then the succession from him of Anencletus (A.D. 80), Clement (A.D. 92), Evarestus (A.D. 100), Alexander A.D. 109), Xystus (A.D. 119), Telesphorus the Martyr (A.D. 128), Hyginus (A.D. 139), Pius (A.D. 142), Anicetus (A.D. 157), Soter (A.D. 168), and at length in his own day, of Eleutherus (A.D. 177).† Certain discrepancies which confessedly exist in the various lists of Roman bishops which have come down to us may be explained by assuming the existence in the very first ages of two distinct Churches, one Jewish and one Gentile, at Rome. Lightfoot, while claiming that "no more can safely be assumed of Linus and Anencletus than that they held some prominent position in the Romish Church,"* adds that "the reason for supposing Clement to have been a bishop is as strong as the universal tradition of the next ages can make it." It in no way detracts from this admission with respect to Clement that Lightfoot regards him rather as "the chief of the presbyters than the chief over presbyters," and consequently not in the position of irresponsible authority occupied by his successors Eleutherus (A.D. 177) and Victor (A.D. 189), or even by his contemporaries Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna.

With Victor, apparently the first Latin prelate who held the bishopric of Rome, a new era begins. The line of ecclesiastical descent is now clearly defined, and by the participation in each consecration of three or more of the episcopal order required by the early canons and continued with scrupulous exactness till the modern view of episcopacy as held by the papacy permitted at times the substitution of the papal authority for the presence of more than a single consecrator, there has been knitted together the meshes of that vast network which in its comprehensiveness includes the Church's chief rulers from the very first, and by the multitude of interlacing lines of succession makes any serious defect in the direct connection with the apostles of any individual bishop well-nigh impossible. The succession of bishops from the apostles' times is not to be regarded as a chain of single links, the whole being of no greater strength than its weakest part, but as a network or web of interwoven strands, now innumerable, which would hold together even if, to venture an impossible supposition, nine-tenths of these lines could be proved defective and therefore invalid. In other words, a possible defect in one, or in a hundred, of the different lines of succession would in no way affect the consecration of any bishop of our day, so infinite in number are the interlacing strands of the great network uniting one who has been set apart for this office and administration in the Church of God with the apostles, and through the apostles with Christ, the Great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls.

AUTHORITIES.—In addition to the late Bishop of Durham's dissertation on "The Christian Ministry," appended to his Commentary on the Philippians, and the many special treatises on the Apostolical Succession by Perceval, Haddon, Elrington, Morse, and others, the latest and most conclusive work on the general subject is that of Gore, "The Ministry of the Christian Church," Rivington's, London, 1889. A compact treatise by the Rev. Professor J. H. Barbour, of the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., is admirably arranged and deserves general reading. Its title is "The Beginnings of the Historic Episcopate Exhibited in the Words of Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors." New York: E & J. B. Young & Co., 1887. Canon Liddon, in his sermon entitled "A Father in Christ" (Rivington's, 1875), effectually disposes of the arguments of the late Dr. Hatch, in his Bampton Lectures on the "Organization of Early Christian Churches," as well as those of a later paper in the *Contemporary Review* from the same source. A scholarly and conclusive volume has just appeared, written in Latin, of upward of six hundred pages octavo, which gives in detail, and with sufficient critical apparatus, both the arguments for the apostolical succession and lists of bishops from the apostles' times to our own day. The title of this work is as follows: "De Successione Apostolica necnon Missione et Jurisdictione Hierarchiæ Anglicanæ et Catholicæ, unacum appendicibus et indicibus: Anctore Venerabili Doctore Jacobo Clark, Archidiacono Antiguensi, Sacellano Exam. Dno. Antiguensi Epo Rectore Par. S. Philippi in Antigua. Georgiopoli in Guiana Britannica: MDCCCXC." The third edition of a clever compendium of the argument, by the Rev. Andrew Gray, a Priest of the Diocese of Massachusetts, has just been published in Boston. It is entitled "Apostolical Succession in the English, Scottish, and American Church, from S. John the Apostle to the present time, in the line of consecrators, taken from authentic records." A learned work by the present Bishop of Oxford, the eminent historian Dr. William Stubbs, gives the succession in the Church of England. The title of this work is "Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum. An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England, from the records and chronicles of the Church." Oxford: University Press, 1858.

---

* Gore's *Ministry of the Christian Church*, chap. iii., p. 119.

† Iren., iii. 3. The dates we have given to the successive incumbents of the See of Rome are from Lightfoot.

* Com. on the Philippians. *The Christian Ministry*, p. 219.

LIFE IN THE EGYPTIAN FAMILY.

BY PROFESSOR DR. HERMANN V. HILPRECHT.

From *The Sunday-School Times* (Undenom.), Philadelphia, October 3 and 10, 1891.

ALTHOUGH centuries have rolled between us and the mighty empires of the ancient world, and a retrospect must bring out everywhere the profound differences between present and past, that old-world life had two features in common with our own, —the family and the state. In the family, the principles of love, piety, and morality prevailed; in the state, the spirit of the law, the spirit of right and might, was sovereign. On both these sides we must examine the life of every established nation of antiquity, if we would have a picture of its social conditions in a faithful historical setting.

Family and state are complemental. The family precedes the state, and gives life to it. And though the state is not simply an evolution of the family, a view supported even by such political writers as Wagner and Dahlmann, still, the course which civilization has taken since the most ancient times has tended to bring the family man and the citizen under a single point of view; and when once we have entered the sphere of order and settled condition, of liberty and personality, it is impossible to keep them apart. The state is the sheltering roof beneath which the family is developed and waxes strong. And the family, on the other hand, becomes the mainstay of the state, and contributes vital strength to the great organism of the commonwealth. "The people (made up of families) forms the state. And the state is the consummation of the people." This sentence of Trendlenburg, of course, expresses the modern view of the relation between state and family, which we know is at variance with the one-sided Aristotleian maxim, "Man is a ζωον πολιτικον" ("a political animal"). But although in the ancient world the individual never attained the proper amount of self-assertion in the state, yet family life was a necessary and important factor in the life of the people, and naturally became the pulse of the state, indicating a healthy or a morbid condition. Thus it was with the Greeks and Romans, with the Germanic nations, with the Babylonians and Assyrians on the Tigris and Euphrates; and the same conditions prevailed on the banks of the lower Nile.

The basis of Egyptian life was agriculture. As to-day the fellahs, so in ancient times the peasants and shepherds were the main stock of the population. As a natural result, the Egyptians, as a whole, were always a peace-loving people, that only took up arms when it was necessary to ward off attacks from without, or when it became desirable to gain possession of the products of neighboring countries. The principal centers of industry and commerce were the numerous cities on both banks of the Nile. Originally clustering about the temples and sanctuaries, they grew, in course of time, to independent communities, and as they increased in size or importance gradually became the representative centers of the intellectual and political life of Egypt. Our present sketch of Egyptian conditions, therefore, will be principally concerned with the inhabitants of these cities, and this the more for the reason that most of the monuments and papyrus relics that have been found throw light only on that part of the population which stood in immediate relation to the royal court and the priests. This class consisted principally of the princes and state officials of every grade, with their families, and their numerous dependants and slaves, in the great cities of upper and lower Egypt. The scene of their activity was the family in private life and the state in public. Let us see how their life at home was passed.*

When we recall the architecture of the ancient Pharaohs, we naturally think of those mighty ruins of tombs and temples which in our century have become the wonder and the center of attraction in the Nile valley. These gigantic structures, however, are rather the exception than the rule in Egyptian architecture. Massive and monumental as were their temples and pyramids, their style of house-building was light and perishable. Their walls, instead of stone, were made of Nile mud. Instead of solid pillars, their roofs were supported by the slender trunks of palms and sycamores. "One feature was common to both temple and house,—the rich glow of color in every part of the structure." In view of the scarcity and fragmentary character of city ruins, it is extremely difficult to obtain a true picture of the Egyptian dwelling-house. Leaving out of consideration for the present the simpler country-house, which was only used during certain seasons of the year, an ordinary dwelling-house of the eighteenth or nineteenth dynasty (about the time of Moses) was constructed as follows: A court surrounded by a high wall separated the building from the street. The entrance was marked by an ante-room or vestibule for the watchman. In the rear of this was the large dining-hall, which formed the center of the house. Back of this there was a small open yard, flanked on the right by the bedrooms of the owners. On the left were the kitchen and storerooms, besides the rooms for the servants. At the farther end was the house of the women and the well-kept garden; for the wealthy Egyptian took great pleasure in his garden or park, and speaks with pride of his fragrant flowers and refreshing fountains.

The love of flowers and shrubbery was a characteristic of the nation. I cannot do better than illustrate this regard for flowers in the words of the prominent Egyptologist of Berlin: "Wherever one looks upon the monuments, there are flowers. Bunches of flowers are offered up to the gods. Garlands of flowers cover the coffins of the dead. Flowers decorate the houses, and floral designs form the capital of the temple pillars. No less is the Egyptian attached to shady trees. He prays that the Nile may give to his soul all flowering plants in due time, and hopes that his soul may perch on the branches of the trees which he has planted, and may find cool repose in the shade of his sycamores. And as the scenery of his native country, with his plowed fields and matchless palm-groves and parched soil, cannot offer him these advantages, he supplies the want by landscape gardening. All the associations that nature, with its wood and meadow, has for us, the Egyptian found in his well-kept garden. It is the place of love, and its trees are the confidants of lovers" (Erman, p. 272). This pronounced liking of the ancient Egyptians is not without significance. A people which took such a delight in gardens and flowers, that decked its tables with lotos and papyrus blossoms, which ornamented house and home with fragrant garlands, must have sought and found in its home life something beyond what the heathendom of antiquity usually offered, and what the Mohammedan Orient of to-day offers to its inhabitants.

Attempts have been made to show that the difference in the position of woman constitutes the essential difference between Orient and Occident. And at the first glance this does seem to be true; for while, in the Occident, woman is the equal of man, and is regarded with a reverence which at times almost assumes the form of woman-worship, in the Egypt and Arabia of to-day we meet with scenes of an entirely different description. The ignorance of Oriental women is proverbial, and the contempt of the female sex is characteristic of life in the East. If a Bedouin speaks of his shoe or ass, his pig or his wife, he often makes the interjection, "*Ajellak Allah!*" ("May God elevate thee.") One of the most current proverbs in the mouth of the Syrian is, "A man can stand anything but mentioning his wives." The question has been discussed among them, in all sincerity, whether woman really belongs to the genus *homo*. But this state of affairs did not always exist. While, to day, devastation and degradation have followed in the train of the crescent, the ancient Egyptians had reached a degree of social development in which they were only rivalled by the richly endowed inhabitants of Sumer and Akkad, on the Persian Gulf.

---

* For several important statements contained in this sketch I am especially indebted to Professor Erman's excellent work, "Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Alterthum" (Tübingen, 1885); to Professor Eduard Meyer's "Geschichte des Alterthums," Vol. I. (Stuttgart, 1884), to which I contributed the results of my own Babylonian researches; and to Brugsch's, Ebers's, Mariette's, and Maspero's well-known publications.

And so it is that in the ancient kingdoms of the Pharaohs matrimony and family life, as the sphere in which woman exercised her dignity, assumed an exceptionally pure and exalted form. When we remember this, we understand more fully why it was that God brought the children of Israel to the banks of the Nile, there to develop into an independent nation. It was through their intercourse with these highly cultivated Egyptians, a people of high moral standards and stern views of life, that the children of Israel were to be schooled and made fit to be true beacon-lights among the nations of the world, and executors of God's eternal plan of salvation.

It was a cordial and intimate relation that existed between man and wife in ancient Egypt. In a number of tombs, and on many a papyrus found in connection with the dead, we see man and wife represented as seated beside each other. In hundreds of these decorations they are represented with their arms fondly wound about each other's necks. The higher the social position of the deceased, the more beautiful and touching are the words referring to their mutual regard and affection. The wife, for instance, is called *ben-t merut eft ha-s* ("palm of love to her husband"); or, besides a hundred other epithets, she is called "devoted to her husband,"—a frequently recurring title of honor given to Egyptian women. Therefore it is very natural that the ancient book of wisdom of the Governor Ptah hôtep, who lived about 3000 B.C., under King Assà, should declare him wise who—to use his own words—"founds for himself a house and loves his wife."

Even these few glimpses into the oldest Egyptian period show that the position of woman was hardly below that which she occupies in the civilized countries of the present day. Add to this the significant fact that most of the pictures of festivities and social gatherings which have been preserved show us both sexes in unrestricted social intercourse, sitting beside each other in long rows of gay colors, and engaged in conversation; also that the female mummies, as a rule, were embalmed much more carefully and adorned more sumptuously than those of men, and that the monuments of nearly every period (even the decree of Canopus under Ptolemæus Euergetes I., 239 B.C.) expressly give to queens and princesses divine honor in common with her Pharaohs. In view of these facts, there can be no doubt of the high respect paid to the Egyptian woman, and of the high esteem with which she was regarded, under the older as well as the later Egyptian dynasties.

In a state where woman was so highly honored, it is but natural to infer that monogamy was prevalent. Such was indeed the case, as has been abundantly proved by the hieroglyphs and the best authorities on hieroglyphic literature. And though there have been individual attempts (as by Erman) to place Egyptian morals on this point on the same low level with those of classic antiquity, yet we must most emphatically assert, with Brugsch, Ebers, Eduard Meyer, and other Egyptologists, that Egyptian family life, especially in the oldest towns, was exceptionally pure and refined. It is true, the custom of intermarriage between sisters and brothers prevalent throughout the ancient heathen world, and mentioned in Egyptian literature, as well as in the Old Testament, became, in the days of the Ptolemys and the Romans, the rule in Egypt; and it is likewise true that such marriages are revolting to our natural moral sense. But in passing judgment upon this custom, we should not forget that, according to the views of those nations, such a marriage seemed the most natural thing; and, according to the belief of the old Egyptians, even the great gods themselves, Osiris and Set, had their sisters, Isis and Nephthys, to wife. Cases of actual bigamy, on the other hand, seem to have been extremely rare among the mass of the people, and restricted to the rulers and nobles at court, who possessed the necessary means to defray the extra expense incurred by the enlarged household.

Political intrigues were often the reason for polygamous marriages in the case of monarchs, as is conclusively shown by the example of King Rameses II. Private individuals were sometimes led into double marriages by acquiring the possessions of a rich Egyptian heiress. It is worth noting, however, that we find the harem only sporadically mentioned on the tombs, which are most communicative on all other subjects, and that at no time were the inhabitants of the harem accorded the rights and privileges of wifehood. One woman was the soul of the house, and was legally bound to the man by a carefully drawn up and well-guarded matrimonial contract. We read on the sarcophagus of Onnophris that she followed her husband as *mert apertet-u noferu;* that is, "as a lovable, beautiful bride." And a high official of the eighteenth dynasty describes his wedding as one of the most important events of his life. Man and wife lived together in their common home. The wife helped her husband in keeping house and in his professional duties. She watched him as he set his bird-snares, or accompanied him as he set out for the hunt, in his skiff, in the swamp among the bulrushes, or in the evening, when he returned to his pleasant home, she welcomed him with open arms.

No part of the Egyptian family life presents a more attractive picture than the relation between parents and children. If a wise patriarch on the banks of the Nile praised even his own house as "the best thing on earth," assuredly the old Egyptian's highest joy was the possession of a happy home and happy children. The joy of parents in the birth of a child frequently found striking expression in the name given it. Thus we find a *Haunefer* ("Beautiful Day"), or a *Duat-nefret* ("Beautiful Morning"). Away back in the earliest period we find girls called *Nefret-en-ets* or *Nebt'et;* that is, "Her Father's Beauty" or "Her Father's Mistress." Another Egyptian embodies all his paternal joy and hope in the name of his daughter, *'Ey-nefer* ("Beauty is Coming"), or in that of his son, *'Ey-d'-efa* ("Wealth is Coming"). In the middle kingdom we find such designations quite common as names of women, as "Sweetness," "Blossom," "Beautiful Sycamore;" while the ripening boy was called "Healthful," "Strong," "Beautiful of Thought" (*Nefer-sechru*), and "Beautiful of Deed" (*Nefer-'ert-nef*). Among Semitic nations, as well as among the Egyptians, it was customary to give animal names to children; but still it seems a singular perversion of taste, and one by no means confined to the lower classes, to give to innocent girls such names as "Tadpole," "Monkey," "Hippopotamus-Daughter," or "Little Cat" (*Myt-sher-'eu*). The inscriptions of the earliest period show that it was quite customary to name the children after the deity specially honored in the family, and so we meet with a *Seker-ch'a-bau* ("Spirit-Beaming is God"), *Seker* or *Nefer-her-en-Ptah* ("Beautiful is the Countenance of Ptah"), or *Neter-user* ("God is Rich"), *Ra'nofer*, *Ra'hotep* ("Rah is Beautiful," "Rah is Well Pleased"). In Egypt the custom of calling children after the ruling prince was even more prevalent than elsewhere, and not infrequently this gives us an important chronological clew. Still we can hardly repress a smile when we read that S'abu, the patriotic old high-priest of Memphis, was so constant in his loyalty that he called four of his promising sprouts *Ptah-shepses.*

These short hints about Egyptian family names give us a glimpse into their family life. Let us attempt to make the picture more complete by looking into the home itself. As soon as a child was born in Egypt, the mother made an offering of praise and thanksgiving to the deity of the city. The first four years of his life our "wise youngster," as he is called in the inscription of the high-priest Beken-chôn (now in Munich), passes under the personal care and supervision of his mother. For three years she nourishes him and carries him about on her back,—a custom that can be observed to this day among the country people along the Nile. During this period, on account of the warm climate, the mother does not spend much time in making clothes for her baby, and the inscriptions tell of a young prince, the grandson of Chufu, or Cheops (builder of the great pyramid, about 3000 B.C.), who became so attached to nature's garb that he did not want to give it up even when he went to school. Of course, these early childhood days were spent in Egypt as they are elsewhere. The boys played with their clowns (a fine specimen of one of them is to be found in the Leyden Museum), or with their toy cats or crocodiles, made of wood (some of which are still preserved in the Berlin Museum).

The little girls in the times of the Pharaohs, as now, bestowed their tenderness and affection upon beautiful dolls which could move their arms and legs. But the time for play was soon over. When the boy reached his fourth year, he was sent to school, or, as the Egyptians express it, he became a writer in the book-house. A plain girdle was in the olden time the only dress of these little scholars. The boy now naturally passed from under the wing of his mother to the jurisdiction of his father. If the father happened to be wealthy, or occupied an influential position in the state, he had his boy educated in company with the young princes at the court of the Pharaoh. At all events, the early instruction of the Egyptian boy had in view his pursuits as a youth and his final calling as a man.

The praiseworthy basis of this Egyptian school life was strict obedience to the father's will, and reverence and respect for elders. The child was drilled in the practical rules of life and morality, which were laid down as guides for action. Thus we read, for example, in a papyrus of the Louvre collection: "Do not follow the advice of a fool," "Build not thy tomb higher than that of thy superior," "Do not maltreat an inferior," "Respect those who are worthy of respect," "Curse not thy master before God," "Contradict not thy master," "Save not thy life at the cost of another," "Repeat not slander," "Be faithful in carrying a message." A so called Egyptian law of etiquette, from a papyrus of the later kingdom of the time of Moses (now in the Great Bulâq Museum) might even now find a place in our street-cars. It reads, "Never forget to be respectful, and do not sit down while one who is older, or holds a superior office, is standing."

Scientific instruction in Egyptian schools was confined principally to exercise in reading and writing the hieroglyphic and hieratic characters. It also included the fundamentals of mathematics and astronomy,—the latter occupying a prominent part in the curriculum, in connection with the studies of the Egyptian deities of light. Gymnastic exercises and swimming lessons also formed a part of the regular course of instruction. Besides this, the children of priests received special training in Egyptian theology, a rather mixed-up affair. The principal aim of this study was to bring some sort of unity and order into the manifold and contradictory religious traditions, to define the sphere of the different national and local deities, and, in short, to establish a theological system, that in its historical development finally resolved itself into a general solar monotheism.

When an extensive household was kept up, there was need of a large number of servants. At the head of these stood the provision-keeper or steward. Such a majordomo was not generally hard pressed in the struggle for existence, as is well illustrated in a burial-scene of the twelfth dynasty, where the honorable gentleman has increased his circumference to such an extent that he is unable to carry the customary offering on the occasion of his master's funeral. Under this so-called "chief" a host of menials were employed, who betitled themselves according to their special duties. Here we meet one who calls himself residence inspector, another is the "overseer of the bake-house;" a third, "secretary of the bar;" another, "manufacturer of sweets;" another, "carrier of cool drinks." And if we continue our rounds through the house we shall meet the "door-tender," the bakers, the butchers, the gardeners, and men of all work, each of whom does his part in keeping up the establishment. It is difficult to determine to what extent these were serfs or freemen. Slavery was, of course, prevalent, and the slave trade flourished. Even leaving out of consideration the great antiquity of this trade, as carried on especially by the Phœnicians, we find sufficient evidence of its existence in Egypt in the numerous representations, on the monuments, of male and female servants of light and dark skin who plainly were not native Egyptians. From the earliest times down to the Alexandrian period frequent mention is made of the labors and casual escape of slaves. The wars with the neighboring negro tribes who dwelt in the narrow and infertile Nile valley, up as far as the third and fourth cataracts, living mainly by agriculture and their flocks, furnished the numerous black slaves, whilst Syrian maidens and Hebrew youths, with their lighter skin, were imported into the Delta by Semitic caravans for a good price. It is probable that, as a rule, these slaves were treated kindly by their Egyptian masters, especially those who had charge of kitchen and cellar; for the Egyptian needed a good meal to complete his happiness.

In the earlier period it was customary for persons to sit two by two at a little table about half a foot high, each tearing off pieces of meat from the roast, without much formality. In the later kingdom, however, people were seated on high bolstered chairs with lions' feet, and were waited on by slaves. We know very little of the culinary art of the Egyptians. The favorite diet was roast goose. The bird was plucked, a skewer put through its neck, and then it was placed in hot ashes in a clay oven. The staff of life, then as now, was bread, and the Harris Papyrus mentions about thirty different kinds, which were baked in pans or pasted on the cone-shaped oven till they were done. Since life after death was regarded as essentially a continuation of the former existence, the prayers for the deceased included a petition for bread, beer, goose, and beef, that the beloved thoroughly enjoy his post-mortem happiness. One of the catalogues of sacrifices that have been discovered demands for the deceased no less than ten different kinds of meat, five different kinds of fowl, sixteen kinds of bread and cake, six kinds of wine, four kinds of beer, and eleven kinds of fruit, besides an assortment of sweets. We see that those old Egyptians must have had a good digestion, and modesty was certainly not one of their weaknesses.

I have twice mentioned beer. This was brewed from ground barley, or from the so-called Upper Egypt wheat, in light and dark color, and was the usual drink of the subjects of the Pharaohs. Even the deceased cannot get along in immortal bliss without his jug of beer. Recognizing this tendency to drink, we are not surprised to find the Egyptians indulging in an occasional carousal, or, as it is called in a love-song (published by Maspero), "instituting a little beer-house." Well did the wise 'Eney teach: "Restrain thyself in drinking beer, else thou wilt fall down and break thy bones, and no one will lend thee a helping hand." But his sayings availed as little as those of the equally wise Danuf, who demanded of his son that he should be satisfied with two jugs of beer and three loaves of bread. The Egyptian youths were head-strong, and went their own way. Full of sorrow, a teacher writes to his pupil:

"They tell me that thou art leaving thy books and giving thyself up to pleasure.

"Thou goest from street to street. Each evening thy beery breath,

"Thy breath of beer, keeps men aloof, and brings thy soul to destruction.

"Thou art as a broken oar, that obeys no longer its oarsman.

"Thou art as a temple without a God, as a house without bread.

"They find thee climbing the wall and breaking the board.

"The people fly before thee, thou strikest them in thy folly.

"O that thou mightest see that wine is a curse!

"O that thou mightest quickly renounce the Shedeh-cup!

"O that thou mightest not set thy heart upon drinks that are cooling,

"But mightest forget the T'enreku!"

As long as these excesses were confined to certain classes, especially to students, who always are inclined to lively pranks, they had no deeper significance, and might possibly be excused; for not only in ancient Rome and Athens, but in Thebes and Memphis as well, the poets encouraged mirth and hilarity. But when, in the Egypt of the later kingdom, we find depicted on the walls of a tomb a scene from the life of the deceased, evidently a woman of rank, representing her in a state of intoxication; or when, in the notorious trial for high treason of the women of King Ramses III.'s harem, the court of inquiry instituted by Pharaoh is making common cause with the female conspirators in a so-called "beer-house" or symposium,—we must admit that there are here unmistakable signs of a general demoralization presaging the downfall of the state.

LIFE IN THE EGYPTIAN STATE.

SECOND PAPER.

In a previous article I have discussed the Egyptian family in its relation to the state, showing that it was the result of historical development in Egypt as elsewhere. I now propose to discuss the Egyptian state briefly, in its principal outlines.*

The Egyptian state, as a study of the monuments pictures it to us, is a well-ordered bureaucracy, with the king as its head in touch with the divine. The whole system was pervaded by a religion that exerted its influence in every sphere of thought and activity.

The fact that the peasantry were not freeholders is an important feature in the Egyptian state. A few privileged nobles, the district chiefs (*nomarchs*) and the territorial aristocracy (*rpâ'*), owned most of the national area, having under their control large territories of forest and field land as family possessions. In different periods the details of the state system varied somewhat. In the oldest period the state government was a decentralized one. The country was divided into forty districts, and each of them subdivided into a number of smaller sections, each with its own judiciary, corn magazines, and military. The central power in this organism was the *Chunu*, or the Department of the Interior, the treasury, with its hundreds and thousands of officials. And just as the treasury department had its chief secretary, one of the principal officials in the state, who, with a host of assistants, superintendents, comptrollers, and clerks of the silver vaults, exercised a close supervision over all the nation's finances, and collected "what the heavens send, what the earth brings forth, and what the Nile deposits," so also the granaries, agriculture, forestry, and justice, and whatever else was under state control, had its own administration. While thus in the older kingdom the hierarchy of government officials, under the supreme head of the powerful monarch, was developed with great minuteness, we find the characteristic of the middle kingdom to be the weakness of the royal house, which makes itself felt throughout the civic system. The nomarchs, who were formerly considered officially responsible to the Pharaohs as his stewards, now become independent. On the other hand, the supervisor of the treasury and finance department succeeded in gradually concentrating an immense power in his own person in a manner detrimental to the public welfare, and in delegating the manifold duties thus devolved upon him to a host of sub-officials, who looked to him for support and continuance in office.

---

* Chapters five, six, and seven, in Erman's "Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Alterthum" (Tübingen, 1885), prove especially instructive for a right understanding of the historical development of the Egyptian state.

The later state, under which Israel grew up as a nation, presents a different picture. The hereditary nobility, who were always insubordinate and inclined to revolt against the Pharaoh, were abolished by King Ta'a and 'Ahmose. The territories left ownerless were either confiscated by force, or compensation was made by conferring honors and titles upon the former owners. This was the origin of the abnormal condition of later Egypt, where all real estate, with the exception of the privileged acres of the priests, was owned by the Pharaoh, who leased it out to his subjects, both freemen and serfs, for a heavy rent.

The foregoing description might leave the impression that Egypt had no other inhabitants but those that constantly meet us on the pictures and inscriptions of the tombs; namely, the nobles, with their vast domains and high offices; the numberless priests of the gods; the thousands of office-holders belonging to both castes, and the hosts of serfs, slaves, and peasants. But then it might well be asked, How was it possible that in a state so curiously circumstanced, with such an excessive power in the hands of the nobles on the one hand, and such a degradation of the commoners on the other, there was such a true family life, such a strong affection for house and home, and in general such a high culture and civilization? But neither the Egypt of the oldest nor that of the latest period was such a slave state; and, though traces of a free middle class in the earliest period are extremely rare, the reason for this is to be found in the fact that the custom of building tombs was novel and not generally prevalent in the early kingdom, and was a luxury practically confined to the highest and wealthiest classes. But in the ruins excavated in the Fayûm by Petrie, and in the tombs of Abydos, in the middle kingdom, we find reference to any number of people that lived, died, and were buried without rank or distinction. There is no cogent reason for not considering these the true middle class in the kingdom of the Pharaohs,—a middle class consisting of well-to-do merchants and mechanics, free citizens as landholders on a small scale, etc., who stood on the same social plane with the royal officials of the state.

To enter upon a discussion of these extremely difficult social relations would be beyond the scope of the present paper. It therefore remains only to sketch briefly the relation of the free citizen to the state, and to show, on the basis of original sources, what were the rights and duties of the Egyptian subject. "We meet everywhere a humane spirit, a lively sense of what is right and just." The laws according to which the court, as well as the Pharaoh himself, made his decision, are preserved in part in the writings of Diodorus Siculus, and in part are known from the monuments themselves. According to these, Egyptian law was brief and strict, but it had in view the welfare of the land and its people. It claimed the honor of having been originally composed and written down, in its essential principles, by the ibis-headed god of wisdom, Thot, the great governor of the sungod Re'.

The murder of a freeman or slave was punished by death. Perjury also was a capital offence, and in the severity of this punishment we see the importance they justly attached to the oath. The adulterer lost his nose, the traitor his tongue, the forger his hand. Infanticide was punished by compelling the mother to hold the dead infant in her arms for three days, and then giving her up to the executioner. Thieves were scourged, and the Lee Papyrus (I.) tells of a conjurer who was said to have been scourged to death. When a prisoner began denying the charge, he was subjected to bastinado, or, as the Egyptians emphatically expressed it, "He was investigated with a thorough investigation."

The tribunal of justice under the old dynasty was the so-called "Grand House" (Peraā, from which our word "Pharaoh" is derived). This was a fixed corporation of high government officers. The great "Court of Justice" of the middle and later empires, however, was a changing body of priests and laymen, differently composed for each case, and sitting either at the gate of the temple or in the famous "Court-room of Pharaoh," specially built for this purpose, as was the case in Southern Thebes. Only the clerk of the court, "the royal writer of truth" as he likes to be called, who keeps the minutes, is a permanently appointed officer, also during the later times. The proceedings are all oral. The officers of the court are sitting, whilst the parties engaged in the trial are standing. In a suit of civil law the claimant first argues his case. The presiding officer declares that it has been heard and calls upon the defendant to answer. After this the court passes sentence, and the one who is fined submits to the decision, exclaiming three times, "I'll do it! Yes, I will surely do it! I will do it!" The procedure in a criminal case differs from this proceeding in three points:

1. The prosecutor in this case is the governor, as the person to whom the charges preferred are to be addressed.
2. The court simply investigates the case, and is satisfied to convict the defendant.
3. The record of the case, as drawn up by the clerk, is submitted to the king. He determines the penalty which is to be inflicted; provided that he should not prefer, in exceptional cases, to pass by the highest officers of the court, and to entrust one or more of his favorites with the investigation and the sentence. This latter method is pursued in cases where the king disliked to have public proceedings conducted before the people. The monuments tell of a number of such criminal cases; as, for instance, the trial of the "great royal spouse 'Emtese" under Pharaoh Pepy, about three thousand years before Christ, or, with even fuller details, the case of the great harem conspiracy under Ramses III., which created a great deal of excitement throughout Egypt, and came very near costing the king his throne and his life.

More might be said, and not without interest, of the methods of procedure in the Egyptian court, but I make only a reference to the obligations under which the people placed themselves in consideration of the protection afforded them, individually and collectively, by the law. The monarch was always in need of a large amount of money to cover the lavish expenditures for temples and temple legacies, for costly gifts, for gigantic structures, and for the support of his immense staff of officials. In order to obtain this, heavy taxes were laid upon the minor office-holders, the middle class, and the peasant serfs who farmed the public lands at an exorbitant metayer rent. One-fifth of his annual produce the tenant was compelled to give to the crown. For the reception of these forced contributions, granaries and magazines were erected throughout the land, and everywhere there were busy scribes who made long lists of the oxen and sheep, and corn and dates, and fruit and wine, and other products that were turned in. No matter how poor the harvest, how low the wages, the king's tax-collector was always on time in his visits to the peasants, accompanied by negroes with clubs. A fifth of even the linen made by the women belonged to the state, and was rigidly exacted. Similar taxes were levied upon the other subjects and the free citizens. Diodorus expressly mentions that every Egyptian was compelled to make an annual assessment of his property and income, to appear before his district supervisor and to prove, under penalty of death, the correctness of his valuation and the sources of his income. A picture from the time of the nineteenth dynasty confirms this. And from a papyrus which has been preserved we know that the woman Takaret, who refused to deliver up the firstlings of her flock to the crown, was hard pressed by the scribes of the governor, and was followed by them into her own house. A written protest by a mechanic, called Amenemue', illustrates the exorbitant character of these taxes. He complains that within four years he had been compelled to make the following payments, and we must admit that for a poor man of his time they are enormous. I give (from Erman, p. 179) a literal translation of the text as found on the Mallet papyrus:

"1. Hide (raw), four pieces, worth 8 uten of copper.

"2. Hide, made into a cuirass, one piece, worth 5 uten copper.

"3. Staff, inlaid work, one piece, worth 4 uten copper.

"4. Staff, one piece, worth 1 uten copper.

"5. Paper, one strip.
"6. Paper, one roll.
"7. Hoe, one, worth 2 uten copper.
"8. Corn, 2¾ bushels.
"9. Flour, 2¾ bushels.
"10. Paper, one roll."

Of course, taxes were paid as reluctantly in old Egypt as they are to-day, and when an assessment was deemed too high, a protest was made. But the state was not likely to make any return, or rebate. When the unusual did happen, the property to be returned seldom saw its owner, but usually stuck to the fingers of one of the numerous sub-officials, through whose hands it had to pass, and who thus insured himself against a possible deficiency in his salary. But this did not prevent the state from collecting the tax due on a returned ass from the unhappy one whose claim had been recognized, but who never had seen his ass again. Such occurrences were only too frequent in the later kingdom.

The original strength and vigor of the Egyptian nation began to languish beneath the heavy burdens laid upon it. Religion, instead of building up, supporting, and renewing the national life, broke down the last bulwarks and unscrupulously gathered in spoils from king and people for the honor of the gods; that is, the profit of the priests. Whilst on the western banks of the Nile gigantic temples rose toward the skies to perpetuate the glory of the Pharaohs, whilst a highly developed material culture pervaded all classes of society, the intellectual and moral life of the nation was becoming entombed in dead traditionalism. The reformation which was attempted by Chuenaten (Amenophis III.) came too late. The national pride which once pulsated throughout the commonwealth was extinct. The free nation of local nobles and tillers of the ground became a mass of cringing office-holders and oppressed serfs, and immorality poisoned and dissolved the beautiful and tender bonds of family life. The priests had crowned their edifice, and firmly held the reins of power in their hands. But a whole nation, with all its splendid endowments, its indefatigable industry, and its contented happiness, had been ruined. The proud inscriptions on the monuments find a sad commentary in the oft-repeated words, "The people are starving, and have no bread."

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

PROFESSOR HIRSCH GRAETZ.

BY A. S. I.

From *The Jewish Messenger*, New York, September 18, 1891.

THE death of Professor Graetz, which was cabled from Munich on Sept. 10th, has come with startling suddenness. Under date of July 27th, he wrote with hopefulness of his new edition of the Old Testament, which was ready for the press. With the completion of his "History of the Jews" and his "Critical Edition of the Bible," a certain symmetry has been given to his career. Unlike Zacharias Frankel, whose published books were largely introductions or first parts, and whose literary works, however valuable, were fragmentary and incomplete, his friend and associate Graetz was more fortunate in giving the stamp of completeness to his productions.

Graetz, born in the Duchy of Posen on Nov. 5th, 1817, was trained as rabbi, but showing no great aptitude for the pulpit, he became a private teacher at Nicolsburg under the patronage of Samson Raphael Hirsch, to whom his first work was dedicated, "Gnosticism and Judaism" (Krotoschin: 1846). Graetz was to develop in after years from the standpoint of Nicolsburg. Some years later he went to Berlin, where he endured many privations as teacher, but found leisure to write noteworthy essays to *Frankel's Monthly* on Talmudic and Jewish historical themes; and when the Breslau Seminary was opened in 1854, he was called to the chair of Jewish history and Bible exegesis—a field to which he consecrated his life.

It was in 1852 when he began to publish his "History of the Jews," which was finished in 1876. The work, of a singularly brilliant and comprehensive character, at once challenged attention. Criticised here and there for an expression or an hypothesis, the industry, the erudition, and the breadth of view aroused profound esteem and raised the work as a whole to the rank of a classic in its field. The impetus given of late years to the study of Jewish history in Germany can be largely traced to Graetz. The animated style, the ready knowledge of materials, that marvellous genius which placed events in juxtaposition and showed the play of cause and effect in the onward march of a solitary people, no less than the warm sympathy for the spiritual aim and teachings of Judaism, and the trenchant denunciation of shams and untruths—invest the volumes of Graetz's History with rare fascination. Disciples had previously told the tale—here was the master whose message was fullest and best.

In his other department—that of Bible exegesis—Graetz has displayed a remarkable fertility of critical resources, but his work has manifestly been less popular. It has appealed to the student, not the general public. His critical genius here has been less constructive, and cannot be followed with so much confidence. His conjectures and suggestions are often wonderful flashes, however. They are usually based upon the old versions and display a wide and exhaustive scholarship. If many of his hypotheses and new readings fail of acceptation, many possess undoubted critical value and add to the intelligibility of disputed or obscure passages of Holy Writ. The appearance of his new critical edition of the Bible, embodying his latest emendations, new and revised, will furnish at least an agreeable occupation to his critics.

With Graetz's passing away, scarcely one prominent name is left to recall the golden era in German Judaism. Steinschneider and Jellinek stand alone in German-speaking lands. Sachs, Rapoport, Krochmal, Fürst, Geiger, Frankel, S. R. Hirsch, Zunz, Philippson, Dukes, and now Graetz have one by one departed. Happily some of these have left their disciples, and not the least illustrious among the younger Jewish scholars abroad are the men who can proudly call Graetz their teacher.

It seems but a short time now since I parted from him, whose three years' continued friendship and instruction had been indeed a precious privilege. He recognized much more clearly than his contemporaries the tendencies which were giving new form and character to Judaism; and it was his constant regret that in America the want of genuine scholarship on the part of leaders and the fondness for sensationalism on the part of the public were likely to produce "A Comedy of Errors" in American Judaism and a "Tempest" besides. I know that he would have gladly come to America a decade or two ago, but the opportunity was lost.

Graetz's method as a teacher was intensely stimulating. He liked to develop the student's own powers. He had his peculiarities, and was not complimentary to hostile critics—Geiger and Ewald, for instance. He never kept to the letter of the subject in hand, whether Talmud, Bible, or History, but illustrated it in the most vivid and delightful way, often from his own personal experiences and travels. He was occasionally caustic, frequently witty, always logical, and rarely carried away by enthusiasm. He held his feelings in strong control.

It is vain to recall and reshape the memories of twelve years ago. One sentence of his, however, has never been forgotten. When parting from him, in student fashion I asked for some special advice: "Hold fast to your History and your Bible," was his terse remark. It was as if he had said: *There* at least the message is clear.

BIRTH OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

From *The Advance* (Cong.), Chicago, October 1, 1891.

"JACOBS, have you got your Sunday-school lesson?"

"No, Whittle, have you?"

"No, I have not looked at it."

"Well," said Mr. Moody, "I have not looked at mine, and this is Friday noon, and every moment this afternoon and to-morrow is spoken for. Now you know we can never face the children and not understand what we are going to talk about. Whittle, you select a good lesson and take the time and study it up, and then write three copies, one for each of us, and we will try it."

"But," said Major Whittle, "we have announced our lessons to the schools and they are all in different places."

"That's so! Well, it's too late to help it now; you go ahead."

The next Monday as they again met for dinner after the noon prayer-meeting, Major Whittle said:

"Moody, how did my lesson go?"

"Why, it was good, or I guess it was. I could not read a word of it, but I got through all right, and the idea is a good one. Jacobs, you write the next one, and don't wait until Friday, but begin early and make a good one."

The Monday noon following Mr. Moody seized Mr. Jacobs with both hands, exclaiming,

"Jacobs, how is it possible that I have lived with you so long and never got acquainted with you before? Why, your lesson was splendid; it was better than I could do myself. *Now* we've got this right, you go ahead and get the lessons up every week."

The next lesson was good, and as other schools called for copies, the Board of Managers of the Young Men's Christian Association decided in the future to have them printed, when Mr. Jacobs, stretching out both arms and bringing his hands together with a slap, exclaimed,

"Boys, what's to hinder getting all Chicago studying the same lesson? Just think of it, wouldn't that be glorious?"

Following the work of the Christian Commission came Mr. Moody's campaign of Sunday-school conventions, which drew together the best workers from all parts of the land and started each forward with clearer aims in his life work. First came Moody, Jacobs, Whittle, Reynolds and Y. M. C. A. men from Chicago. Then later, following each other in succession, came Vincent, Eggleston, Blackall and Hazard, while the songs of Bliss and Sankey, wet with the dews of heaven, came down by the way and fused all hearts by their inspiring melodies. When Mr. Skinner was president of the Cook County Sunday-school Union, they first employed Mr. Vincent for one year. Later, when the Union dissolved, Messrs. Adams, Blackmar and Lyon bought *The Teacher* and took Mr. Vincent into their employ. For particulars of these periods Mr. Skinner and Mr. Blackmar are referred to.

How often, when oppressed by his inabilities and by his lack of reliable financial support, Mr. Moody has said, Oh, if I had the education of some of these city ministers, with their large salaries, what could I not accomplish for the Master!

Mr. Vincent came into the Sunday-school work with a finished education, and after being still farther prepared when the Methodists gave him their support, then he rose in a career that for strength of organization, vastness of accomplishment and beauty of its Chautauqua has led and enlightened the whole world. WITNESS.

END OF THE MACQUEARY CASE.

From *The Standard of the Cross* (Epis.), Philadelphia, October 3, 1891.

CLEVELAND, O., Sept. 26th, 1891.

THE MacQueary case, so far as the official action of the Church and its representatives is concerned, has at last found a termination. The following letter, bearing date Sept. 22d, was sent to Bishop Leonard:

"Right Reverend and Dear Sir.—The third and the last sentence you pronounced upon me leaves me the alternative of resigning from the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or of being restored thereto, by complying with the conditions of restoration prescribed. I have determined not to make the promise required of me, for if I were to do so I would thereby admit that the ecclesiastical powers had a right to impose the sentence upon me, and this I shall never admit. Besides, even if I could conscientiously make the required promise, I still hold the opinions condemned. Nothing has been said or done during the past year to disprove these opinions; but, on the contrary, much has happened to confirm them, and I doubt not that further investigation and study will more completely establish them, for the Church seems to have nothing but denunciations and excommunications to offer in support of her dogmas. For such reasons I renounce the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and ask that my renunciation thereof be at once formally noted by the ecclesiastical authorities. I am very respectfully,

"HOWARD MACQUEARY.

"To the Rt. Rev. WILLIAM A. LEONARD, D.D., Bishop of Ohio."

In accordance with his request, Mr. MacQueary has been deposed from the ministry, the deposition being pronounced at Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland, after the evening service on Friday, Sept. 25th. It is announced that Mr. MacQueary has entered the Universalist body and will accept the charge of a congregation in Saginaw, Michigan. "Then had the churches rest."

PARAGRAPHIC.

FOR two guineas a buyer in a Bristol (England) auction-room recently secured the last letter that Dickens wrote. It is as follows:

"It would be quite inconceivable to me—but for your letter—that any reasonable reader could possibly attach a scriptural reference to a passage in a book of mine, reproducing a much abused social figure of speech, impressed into all sorts of service on all sorts of inappropriate occasions, without the faintest connection of it with its original source. I am truly shocked to find that any reader can make the mistake.

"I have always striven in my writings to express veneration for the life and lessons of our Saviour, because I feel it; and because I rewrote that history for my children—every one of whom knew it from having it repeated to them long before they could read, and almost as soon as they could speak.

"But I have never made proclamation of this from the house-tops."—*The Christian Union.*

IT is said that Richard Baxter, in reviewing his life, related that in his early years the miraculous evidences for Christianity influenced him most; in his middle life the prophetic and historical; but in his later years, the fitness of Christianity to give rest to his spirit was to him the most convincing evidence.—*The Churchman.*

REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, the brilliant London Methodist, is credited with this witticism: "A committee *at* your back is a very good thing, but one *on* your back isn't. I am of the opinion of William Jay of Bath, that if the building of the ark had been left to a committee it wouldn't be done yet."—*Christian Herald.*

THE Bishop of Derry, who has all but attained the "threescore years and ten," has been invited to cross the Atlantic for the purpose of giving a series of lectures in New York during next Lent. He has, we understand, accepted the invitation. The subject of the lectures is to be "The Evidences of Christianity," which is rather a large order. Dr. Alexander will doubtless single out some department of the vast theme upon which to dilate in New York City. The Bishop of Derry is an Irishman, and Irishmen in the way of travel are able to do what other men shrink from. The Bishop of Derry is eloquent without being diffuse, which we cannot say of many of his fellow countrymen. There are certain poetic touches which occur in his sermons, heights which catch the sunlight of a brighter world, which are rendered the more beautiful because they are surrounded by a good deal of solid thought, and are not the mere frothy effervescence of a runaway tongue. We congratulate the trustees of Columbia College upon their choice of a Lenten lecturer, and trust that the Bishop of Derry may have health and strength to carry out his intention.—*Literary Churchman.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

GOSPEL-CRITICISM AND HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY. A Study of the Gospels and of the History of the Gospel-Canon during the Second Century. With a Consideration of the Results of Modern Criticism. By ORELLO CONE, D.D. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1891. Pp. xii., 365, 8vo, $1.75.

Whatever feeling one may have about the conclusions of this book, no one can help admiring the spirit of it. It is evidently the work of a scholar, and it is written throughout in the scholarly spirit—fair, judicial, and thorough. The question, too, is one of the most important in the department of biblical learning, being concerned with the historical bases of Christianity, and it has met with a corresponding fulness and carefulness of treatment from biblical scholars. The writer of this treatise shows his acquaintance with all this work, and his book is a good summing up of their results. His attitude is that of a conservative critic with reference to the origin of the Synoptical Gospels, non-committal toward the Fourth Gospel, with an inclination to accept the Johannean "nucleus" of the Gospel, but to reject the traditional authorship. In regard to the main question of the historical trustworthiness of the Gospels, he holds that it is the work of criticism to separate historical from unhistorical components of these writings, and that it has already set aside the supernatural birth, the transfiguration, the voice from heaven at the baptism and the like. But he contends that the positive result of criticism is greater, bringing "out into greater distinctness the essentials of the Gospel history, and establishing the kernel of the history of Jesus in an inexpugnable position."

His definition of what is meant by canonical writings, showing that it means very much the same as "classical," is capital, and in his history of the canon he shows that it was established by the same unconscious process as determines the selection of classical works. At first there were no writings, and such as were gradually brought out by the circumstances of the times were not held in any reverence, there being no disposition to elevate any Christian writings to the rank of Scripture, which was held by the Old Testament books. There were parties in the Church, and one party had no disposition to accept the writings of the other; the spirit of catholicity, which should establish a common standard of the faith and a common Scripture, was a later growth; and above all, there was the expectation of a speedy second coming, which made a narrow horizon for the Church in which there was no call for any written standard such as the New Testament. He gives a review of writings of the second century, showing that the authors esteemed oral tradition above any books; that in their citation of the facts of the Gospel history they used the Four Gospels, but also other records of the same events; and that there was certainly no disposition to set the Gospels in a place by themselves as specially inspired and authoritative accounts. It was not until the last quarter of the century that a canon began to be established, and even then it was a different collection from our present canon, and unsettled in its character.

In regard to the synoptical problem, Dr. Cone accepts what may be regarded as the view of conservative criticism. According to this, our present Gospel of Mark, with the so-called Logia of Matthew, are the original writings from which came the Synoptical Gospels. There are evidently other sources, from one of which are taken the portions peculiar to Luke's narrative, and the accounts of the birth and childhood of our Lord in Matthew and Luke are from different and variant sources. The one fact which shows that the Synoptical Gospels are thus interdependent is the verbal coincidence in so many places of them all. This verbal resemblance makes it simply impossible that they should be independent reports of oral tradition, and assures us that they must be interdependent, or dependent on some common written source. With this is combined the statement of Papias that Mark wrote a gospel after the story told by Peter, and that Matthew wrote out in Aramaic the Logia of Jesus. This Gospel of Mark there is no reason to distinguish from our second Gospel; and, on the other hand, all the accounts that we have of any gospel by Matthew are to the effect that it was written in Aramaic, which excludes the supposition that it was our first Gospel. Further, Dr. Cone supposes that Mark was written at Rome about the year 69 A.D. Matthew he supposes to have been written by a Jew of the dispersion some time after the year 70. Luke he thinks may have been written by the companion of Paul, about the year 90, and on Gentile-Christian soil. Both of these compositions show their dependence on Mark and on the Logia of Matthew.

In the discussion of the question of the Fourth Gospel, the writer indicates his own point of view, when he says that the problem is not to be solved offhand by radical criticism, nor to be pronounced upon *ex cathedra* by conservative dogmatism. Accordingly, he presents the incontestable facts, and maintains a wise caution in regard to results. These facts are, first, the indecisive character of the external evidences of its origin; secondly, the marked difference from the other Gospels in regard to the external events, scenes, and times of our Lord's ministry, but especially in regard to the character of our Lord's teaching and person; thirdly, the dominance of certain ideas and tendencies in the teaching, and even in the representation of events; fourthly, the profound spirituality and verisimilitude of many of the sayings, precluding the idea of invention; fifthly, the difference between this Gospel and the Apocalypse, and, on the other hand, the resemblance of the Gospel to the first Epistle of John. On the whole, the writer thinks that it cannot be the work of an apostle, but that it has a basis of apostolic authority in certain sayings of Jesus handed down from the Apostle John. The author had a relation to the apostle somewhat analogous to that of the first evangelist to Matthew, and he wrote sometime in the second quarter of the second century.

We agree entirely with Dr. Cone in regard to the difficulty and complexity of the problem, which is sufficiently set forth in his presentation of the facts. But he omits two very important factors: First, the fact that the Fourth Gospel is identical with the same in the Diatessaron of Tatian, which forces the time back to the second, if not the first decade of the second century; and secondly, the wide gap which separates this from every writing of that century that has come down to us. There are difficulties—and grave difficulties they are—in the way of assigning the Gospel to its reputed author; but it is certainly no less difficult to ascribe this profoundly spiritual Gospel to an unknown person of a century barren of religious ideas and of literary skill.

Dr. Cone devotes a chapter to the eschatological discourses of Jesus, a subject of the greatest importance. He finds that everywhere else Jesus spiritualized the Messianic conception of the Jews, while in these discourses He is supposed to have taken up those conceptions in their most literal sense. And he concludes, therefore, that they are founded upon certain prophetic teachings of our Lord in regard to the future of His kingdom, which were in harmony with the generally spiritual character of His teaching, but which have been given a Jewish-Messianic coloring by His disciples. That He should have taught His followers to expect His coming on the clouds of heaven, attended by hosts of angels, and that this coming would be attended by a world judgment, seems to the author impossible. And there would be certainly a suspicious difference between this and the rest of His teaching, a falling away from the spiritual height of His whole ministry just at the climax of it, if we had to attribute this language to Him in a literal sense. But it does not seem necessary to do this. This language is just that employed by the prophets in depicting what they see to be a Divine interference in human events, but in which the only things appearing to human vision are the human factors, the natural events of war, of storm, of plague, of national disaster and overthrow. The prophet sees in these things a power behind the veil, a coming of the Divine into the human course of things, which he clothes in these imaginative forms. Every element of apocalyptic description in the discourses of Jesus can be paralleled in the Old Testament prophecies of such events, as the destruction of cities, in which evidently there was no expectation that the language should be taken literally. Moreover, the author himself cites one word which is decisive, so it would seem, in favor of this view. In Jesus' answer to the question of the high priest, whether He were the Christ, He says, "Ap' arti (English version, hereafter) ye shall see the Son of man seated at right hand of power, and coming upon the clouds of heaven." Now this note of time does not mean "hereafter"—that is, at some future time, but "henceforth," or from this time forward. This distinct assertion that the manifestation of Christ in power and His coming in the clouds of heaven is to begin from that very time, shows that it is not to be taken literally, but that it is a figurative description of the spiritual power to be wielded by Him beginning with the time of His suffering. And this interpretation is confirmed by the fact that the same language is used of His coming in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, inasmuch as it shows that the coming is not a single event, but the Divine and supernatural meaning given to several events, and even to periods of time.

In the chapters on dogmatic tendencies in the Gospels, and on the Old Testament in the Gospels, Dr. Cone finds that the authors wrote as men of their time, subject to its influences, and adopting its methods. Matthew, for instance, wrote as a Jewish Christian, and Luke as a Pauline Christian, and their Gospels are so far tendency writings, but without any conscious purpose to color, or shape, or select their material, so as to maintain their views. And in their interpretation of the Old Testament, they adopted the allegorizing method common to their time, and by which they were able to obtain from it material in confirmation of their ideas. It ought to be said in modification of this view, however, that the writings of the New Testament show comparatively little of this tendency, and are sober and sane compared with other Jewish writings of their period.

This quality in them is distinctly recognized in the chapter on the Gospels as histories, in which the author sums up the most important results. "It should be kept in mind," he says, "in considering the perils to which the synoptists were exposed from oral tradition or from any other source, that they appear to have been men of exceptionally sound and sober judgment. This quality is evinced in the nature of their writings, and is a factor in the historical character of these which cannot be too highly estimated." But while "they contain historical reminiscences of Jesus, vivid pictures of His life, striking sketches of His character, and, above all, authentic reproductions of His great teachings," there are also discernible in them distinct Jewish-Christian and Pauline-Christian elements; "what reverence, faith, and wonder had wrought of transformation in His tradition, and what the glamour of poetry had wrought in His legend." This mixture of historical and unhistorical elements makes it necessary for criticism to separate and discriminate, a delicate and difficult task, but one which the writer thinks cannot be neglected nor ignored by the scholar. It is in the positiveness with which Dr. Cone himself proceeds to perform this task, and apply the pruning-knife to the record, that we think he fails to keep himself within the bounds of sober criticism. But in his last chapter, on Criticism and Historical Christianity, he shows that the critical process tends to confirm historical Christianity by establishing the general credibility of the Synoptical Gospels as to the essential teachings and the character of Jesus. So far as Christianity means that "Jesus of Nazareth lived; that He was a personality of unsurpassed moral and spiritual greatness; that He taught a religion based on the doctrine that God is the Father of all men, and that all men are brothers, the central, practical precept of which was love to God and man; that He lived a blameless, worshipful life of consecration and service, in which His great teachings were eminently illustrated; that He performed works which in His age were regarded as wonders; that after an amazing and brilliant career of a few months in Galilee He was crucified in Jerusalem; and that He was thereupon in some way manifested to His disciples as victorious over death;" it finds in criticism a helpful ally. Both the positive and negative sides of this statement show that the writer is himself a good example of what he finds in the Gospels—one who writes as a man of his own times and out of his special environment as a liberal Christian. But he has produced a valuable and scholarly book.

E. P. GOULD.

EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

HISTORISCH-KRITISCHE EINLEITUNG IN DIE BÜCHER DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung von Dr. A. KUENEN, Professor zu Leiden. Autorisirte deutsche Ausgabe von Professor Dr. Th. Weber (†). Erster Theil, Zweites Stück. DIE HISTORISCHEN BÜCHER DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS. Leipzig O. R. Reisland; New York: Gustav Stechert 1890. 8vo, pp. viii., 223, 6 marks.

This work, as is seen from its title, is a second part, and is entirely dependent for its conclusions upon the author's theory of the composition and origin of the Hexateuch presented in the first part. There Dr. Kuenen, we surmise, according to his well-known views, has assigned the Deuteronomist document of the Hexateuch to the age of Josiah and the priest's code to the fifth century B.C. In this part he proceeds to analyze the historical books on the assumption that whatever in any way reflects the distinctive teachings or ideas of these documents must be synchronous with them. Thus the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, which are regarded as constituting properly a continuous history, are found to exhibit different strata of literary material corresponding to different stages of Israel's religious development, and thus belonging to different periods, and hence the work of different authors or editors. The books of Samuel, for example, show the following : To a historical writer of the first half of the seventh century B.C. are due 1 Sam. i., ii. 11–26 ; iii. 1–vii. 2*a* ; ix. 1–x. 7, 9–16 ; xi. in part ; xiii. 1–7, 15*b*–xiv. 51 ; xvi. 14–23 ; xvii. 1–xviii. 5, 6–30 (LXX.) ; xix. 1–17 ; xxi. 2–10 ; xxii. 1–xxiii. 13 ; . . . xxv.; xxvii. 1–xxviii. 2 ; xxix.–xxxi. in part ; 2 Sam. i. 1–v. 16 ; vi.; viii.; ix–xx., and possibly 1 Sam. xvii. 1–xviii. 5. Later than these yet earlier than the time of Deuteronomy 1 Sam. xx. 1*b*–xxi. 1, 11–16 ; xxiii. 14–xxiv.; xxvi.: 2 Sam. v. 17–25. Of uncertain relationship to Deuteronomy 1 Sam. xv.; xxviii. 3–25, and xxxi. in its present form. Of the period of Deuteronomy 1 Sam. ii. (1–10 ?) 27–36 ; 2 Sam. vii.; of the same period but later, 1 Sam. vii. 2*b*–viii. 22 ; x. 17–26 ; xi. in part ; xii.; xvi. 1–13 ; xix. 18–xx. 1*a* ; also 1 Sam. x. 8 ; xiii. 15*a*.

As a result in respect to Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, there is first a pre-exilic author of the history of the Kings, who in the spirit of Deuteronomy worked over the history of Samuel, Saul, and David as he found it compiled by others. (See the analysis just mentioned.) Whether he incorporated into his work any traditions of the time of the Judges is doubtful. A younger author probably joined Judges ii. 6–xvi. to his work. After this there comes another editor or author who worked over the material again and separated the history into the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, making the additions to the previous material of Judges i. 1–ii. 5 ; xvii.–xxi. ; 2 Sam. xxi.–xxiv. This writer most probably flourished in the first half of the fifth century B.C. Another later writer works over Judges xix.–xxi. and adds 1 Sam. vii. ff.

This critical analysis is supported by a most thorough and minute examination of these books. The author appears lynx-eyed, and brings to light many interesting phenomena of expression and statement. In favor of his results is the plain character of these books as compilations of early histories and stories, written frequently from different points of view. They also are anonymous. Their date, too, must always be a matter of conjecture. They show likewise in their present form glosses and inaccuracies, and thus they may be easily adjusted to Dr. Kuenen's view of Israel's history and the material of the Hexateuch. If, however, Dr. Kuenen is here radically in error, as we believe him to be, his conclusions concerning these historical books rest at once upon no substantial foundation, and have little or no claim for acceptance. The history which he has placed behind these writings' gives the force to his analysis and dates. His work, however, cannot be ignored, and will always be full of suggestion and helpful in determining the true character of these writings. In it, however, literary criticism is carried to an unwarranted extreme. There is too great a disposition to "cook" the narratives examined, and assume on mere hypothesis that words and paragraphs opposed to certain theories are merely the insertion of later editors. A certain artificiality is also ascribed to the writers, depriving their narratives of genuine historic worth. The number of the Judges recorded, for example, is supposed to be determined by a desire to conform to the number twelve.

The books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are treated in a manner similar to those just mentioned.

They are regarded as constituting originally one work. Their author had in mind in the first part of his writing nothing less than a reconstruction of the history of his people during the centuries before the exile, in order to harmonize it with the priests' code. He had, however, predecessors in this work, of whose writings he made use. The history after the exile was treated in the same spirit. This writer belonged to the Grecian period of Jewish history. The two books Ruth and Esther are regarded by Dr. Kuenen as unhistorical. The former he considers a beautiful tale of religious instruction, written in the second half of the fifth century B.C., designed primarily to teach the principle upon which a Gentile woman might be incorporated into Israel. The latter, a work of fiction, whose object is to commend the feast of Purim, is assigned to the second century B.C.

EDWARD L. CURTIS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE GENERAL EPISTLES OF ST. JAMES AND ST. JUDE. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham ; formerly Fellow and Senior Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. (The Expositor's Bible.) New York : A. C. Armstrong & Co. Pp. x., 476, $1.50.

This book is a worthy addition to the excellent series of biblical expositions to which it belongs ; for while it is not as brilliant in style as Smith's two volumes on Isaiah nor so original in its views and conclusions, it shows a careful study and a strong grasp of the epistles of which it treats and a deep sympathy with the ideas which it expounds. As to this sort of biblical handbook, there can be no question as to its value in aiding the clergy to get at the ideas of the biblical writers as a whole ; for there is always the temptation to take them piecemeal, in paragraphs, and chapters, or even single verses, and to set forth this or that isolated thought as the truth which the writer holds, whereas it is not the truth which he had in mind, but a mere fraction of it, which by itself does not convey the author's meaning at all. It is strange that while this is recognized immediately as true in the case of secular writers, it should so often be neglected when one is dealing with the writers of the Bible. Such books as this under review will always do good in bringing the mind back to the comprehension of the fact that each inspired writer has one point in view throughout his book, and that all his expressions have their true meaning only in relation with that central thought. Whether we agree or not with the expositor's conclusions, we cannot follow him systematically in his exposition without getting somewhat deeper into the mind and thought of the sacred author. Thus much we may say as to the value of the book before us as a whole, and its usefulness for those whose business it is to preach the whole truth of the Bible. It has, however, also another interest for those who have the scholar's sympathy with the critical questions involved in the study of the Bible; for Dr. Plummer naturally prefaces his expositions with a brief statement of his position as regards the authenticity and authority of his text; and from a man of his well-known scholarship and recognized authority, we cannot fail to get something on these points which is well worth considering. In the introduction he treats of the Catholic Epistles in general, maintaining that they bear this title not as a designation and defence of their orthodoxy and canonicity, nor as a sign of their applicability generally to both Jews and Gentiles, but because they are addressed to Christians universally, without regard to local church relations. In this series of epistles, that of St. James is by most authorities given the first place, while that of St. Jude is placed last, "because of its comparative insignificance, and because it was not at first universally admitted." Dr. Plummer's view is that both these epistles present us with that Judaic form of Christianity which was really the complement of the teaching of St. Paul, although quite capable by exaggeration of being transformed into its opposite. In the special discussion of St. James, which follows this introduction, we find an admirably clear statement of the expositor's critical position as to its authenticity and canonicity. That the epistle remained unknown for some time to many of the early churches, and, when it became generally known, that it was long uncertain as to whether the writer was really an apostle and had canonical authority, are the grounds upon which suspicion has been thrown upon the book. But Dr. Plummer thinks that it is not strange that such an epistle should have remained unknown for some time to the Church at large; for it was addressed by a Jew, whose influence was limited to Jerusalem, to Jewish Christians, who by their conservatism were cut off from free intercourse with other Christians. It was intended to be read in Christian synagogues, and would, therefore, be but slowly communicated to other more liberally minded Christian assemblies. There is no evidence, as even Harnack shows, that the earliest authorities on the canon rejected it, but their silence simply shows that they had never heard of it; and yet the epistle was not wholly unknown at a very early date. Dr. Plummer cites Bishop Lightfoot as decidedly of the opinion that it was known to Clement of Rome, and he himself thinks it was certainly known to Hermas in the first half, and possibly the first quarter of the second century. The conclusive evidence, however, is found in the fact that the epistle is included in the ancient Syriac version of the second century, known as the Peshitto. Adding to this the internal evidence, which shows the character of the epistle to be in close harmony with the character of St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and of that special type of Christians, to whom it was addressed, in Dr. Plummer's opinion, the weight of testimony is preponderatingly against the charge of forgery and in favor of the authenticity of the book. The difficult question of the authorship of the epistle is then taken up and presented in its various phases. Which St. James wrote the epistle? Was it James the Apostle, the son of Zebedee and brother of John the Apostle, or James the Apostle, the son of Alphæus, known as James the Little, or was it James, the brother of the Lord, the Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, and brother of the Jude who wrote the epistle? Into a choice between these three the whole inquiry resolves itself. The earliest MSS. of the Peshitto, dating from the fifth to the eighth century, attribute it to James the Apostle, and later editors of this version certainly ascribe it to the son of Zebedee; but Dr. Plummer finds so many difficulties in the way of this view that he is constrained to assign the epistle to James the Just, the brother of Jesus and Bishop of Jerusalem, and thus refuses it the mark of apostolic authorship, though bringing it into close and living connection with the personal teaching of the Lord, and making it only second in rank to the purely apostolic writings. In Dr. Plummer's view, therefore, the epistle is authentic and canonical and apostolic in spirit, if not strictly in name. As to St. Jude the same lines of inquiry are followed, as the difficulties here are very much the same as in the case of St. James. The epistle remained long unknown, and when it became known the authority of its writer remained for some time doubtful, and in addition it cites the apocryphal Book of Enoch, which was supposed to be unlikely of an inspired apostle. Dr. Plummer, however, sees no great force in the objection that the epistle was so long unknown, the same considerations prevailing here as in the case of St. James' epistle, to explain the silence regarding it. The one really strong evidence against the epistle is its absence from the Peshitto, but this seems to be offset by its presence in the Muratorian Canon and in the old Latin version. Tertullian and Augustine speak of it plainly as the work of the Apostle Jude. Clement of Alexandria quotes and comments upon it as Scripture. Origen accepted it, Athanasius places it without question among the Canonical Scriptures, and Didymus of Alexandria and Jerome condemn those who oppose it. This mass of evidence leads even Harnack to admit its general acceptance about A.D. 200, and induces Dr. Plummer to regard it as sufficiently proved that the Epistle of St. Jude is an authentic product of the apostolic age. Who, then, is the St. Jude who wrote the epistle? Was it "Judas not Iscariot, also called Thaddæus, or Judas one of the four brethren of the Lord? Although Tertullian and Augustine speak of the writer as an apostle, there are strong probabilities against this opinion. The writer would scarcely have neglected to mention the fact of his apostleship as giving greater weight to his words, for, unlike St. Paul, he was far from being a well-known personage throughout the churches. His only personal claim upon the respect of those to whom he writes is that he is the "brother of James," whose epistle was probably well known in the circle which he addressed. Dr. Plummer, therefore, concludes that the epistle is the work of the Judas who is mentioned as one of the four brethren of the Lord, and that it was probably written before A.D. 81, when Domitian ascended the throne. Thus both of these epistles are traced back to the immediate family circle of Jesus, and in the ethical simplicity of their thought and expression probably reflect something of the characteristic spirit and manner of the Master Himself. For both letters, as Dr. Plummer says, are Palestinian in origin and Jewish in tone, and are almost entirely practical in their aim. They show us Christianity as a high-minded, ethical conviction, chiefly occupied with correcting conduct and inspiring men with exalted views of life and duty. The Greek spirit of systematic and logical speculation had not yet mingled itself with the simpler Hebrew spirit, and moved it to transform its convictions into doctrines and arguments. The change had to come, but it is something to be able to see what Christianity was before it did come. We may well be thankful to Dr. Plummer for helping us to understand more clearly just what these simple Christian men, in the earnestness of their faith, felt and thought.

H. RICHARD HARRIS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

HAND-COMMENTAR ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Zweiter Band. Erste Abtheilung. Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die Korinther. Bearbeitet von PAUL WILHELM SCHMIEDEL. Zweite Hälfte. Freiburg-i-B.: Mohr; New York: Stechert, 1891. 8vo, pp. 113–276, 3.20 marks.

This second part of Schmiedel's commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians begins at the second verse of 1 Cor. ix., carries the exegesis through 2 Corinthians, contains a register of the proper names, words, and themes touched upon, and at the *end* a *Vorwort.* Owing to the abundant use of abbreviations, sometimes a little confusing, the amount of matter in the volume is much greater than would ordinarily be associated with its one hundred and seventy-five pages. The author's aim to give a precise explanation in the narrowest conceivable space, an explanation that should embody the full results of scientific research and should stimulate the reader to independent work, is realized in large measure. A page of the book often weighs as much as ten pages of other commentaries. It cannot be appreciated without much study. Knowledge of the New Testament lexicon and New Testament grammar, on the use of which the author in his Preface lays just emphasis, is constantly assumed. Discussion of the meaning of words, excepting those which are of especial importance, theologically or otherwise, is excluded.

It may be mentioned here incidentally, as an item of special interest to New Testament students, that Schmiedel, according to the Preface in his commentary, is preparing a revised edition of Winer's New Testament grammar.

Before passing to the exegesis of the Corinthian Epistles, which can be but briefly characterized, it may be noticed that the author departs from the established custom of commenting on the words of the text in their order. In more difficult passages, he takes first that word which is most independent, then that which follows most naturally and logically.

The character of Schmiedel's work can be suggested by reference to some of the more difficult passages. 1 Cor. x. 17 he translates: "Since it is one bread (which we break), we, the many, are one body." This differs from the American revision in putting the emphasis not on the *existence* of one bread, but upon the fact that the bread is *one.* The ordinary construction (that of the English revision) is rejected as inconsistent with the last clause of the verse and as yielding an inappropriate thought. The abrupt transition from vs. 16 to vs. 17 may suggest that the latter is an interpolation, but perhaps points to a peculiar conception of the Lord's Supper. The blood of Jesus points to His death as securing salvation; the body of Christ, on the contrary, is the mystical body of the exalted One. Accordingly the breaking of the one bread does not symbolize the death of the earthly body, but the oneness of the mystical body in its relation to each individual member.

Schmiedel suggests that the difficult reference to angels in 1 Cor. xi. 10 be explained with the aid of Gen. vi. 1 f. The limitation to married women may be in form only. He does not think it needful, with Baur and others, to drop the verse as an interpolation.

The apparent conflict between xi. 5 and xiv. 34 is harmonized, with Hofman, by limiting the former passage to family gatherings. Heinrici's view that xiv. 34 refers to forward and impertinent questions is regarded as improbable.

Schmiedel regards *θριαμβεύειν* in 2 Cor. ii. 14 as a causative verb. "Thanks be unto God, who always causes us to triumph in Christ—*i.e.*, in the work of Christ." This meaning, he thinks, is variously called for, as against the common interpretation. The thought of Paul as being led in the procession of a conqueror, to grace that procession as an eminent trophy, has no connection with the context, and is moreover excluded by the words "through us" at the close of the verse.

These passages may be taken as samples of the book. In their discussion, as elsewhere, we find thoroughness, fairness, and independence.

Throughout the volume, separate from the exegesis, there are condensed and valuable discussions of difficult questions. Such are the excursus on the Lord's Supper, spiritual gifts, the resurrection, the atonement, and on the vision of 2 Cor. xii.

The general critical position of the Hand-Commentar need not be defined here, and space forbids any further reference to this valuable contribution of Professor Schmiedel.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

STUDIES IN JOHN'S GOSPEL, THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST'S DEITY. By Rev. DAVID GREGG, D D. New York: American Tract Society. 12mo, pp. 348.

This volume appears to consist of what are known in technical homiletics as "exegetical sermons," and it follows the course of the International Sunday-school Lessons for the current half-year in twenty-four "studies," for each of which some central sentence of the weekly lesson forms a text.

If these limitations of design be borne in mind, the volume will not disappoint its readers. It were as easy as it were ungracious to find minor defects. For example, the style is often repetitious and disfigured by colloquialisms; there is a tendency to "improve" where it is very doubtful whether either the evangelist or the Holy Spirit had any didactic intention whatever; there are occasional slips of logic, as when (p. 152) from our Lord's declaration that "neither did *this* man sin nor his parents," that he should be born blind, the deduction is made that "God takes all the responsibility for the deformities which men bring with them into the world;" there is an uncritical, not to say unscholarly inclination to accept the "Acts of Pilate" and the story of the Roman Senate publicly debating the acknowledgment of Christ as one of the city's gods on the ground of His conceded resurrection (pp. 329–30); and finally there is a tendency to take for granted disputed interpretations of Scripture.

However, the imperfections just recounted, although serious, are occasional only, and not characteristic of the whole volume. These lectures are alike excellent for their apparently original purpose of pastoral instruction of an audience of ordinary culture, and for placing on the list of the useful publications of the American Tract Society. The book is fresh, practical, and thoroughly orthodox, according to the older type. Hardly any one could read it without spiritual quickening and advantage. But whoso would procure it should understand that it touches none of the difficult questions so long and hotly debated by critical scholars, and was never intended to be a rival of the handbooks of "Introduction," or even of commentary, which the well-furnished theological bookshelf knows so well. Sunday-school teachers will not find in it much material directly helpful in preparing for their classes, nor will advanced students get critical aid from its pages. Its place is rather among the books of devotional and practical piety, and there it is above the average.

MANCIUS H. HUTTON.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. The Biblical Evidence. By RICHARD N. DAVIES. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe; New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891. 12mo, pp. 234, 90 cents.

The author has rightly interpreted the needs of the pulpit and the pew. As there is in the churches of America a strong current of thought toward a false idea of divine unity, a work on the "Doctrine of the Trinity" comes in answer to a demand. It has "been written for those who are just beginning their biblical studies;" and the aim is to "furnish the young student of divinity with a plain, courteous, and trustworthy answer to the objections of those who reject the doctrine of a Triune Deity."

This book maintains in the main a sound biblical view of the Godhead; first of all laying stress on the *one* God, and distinguishing Father, Son, and Spirit as three distinct persons in the One. After presenting briefly the teaching of the Bible on the unity of God, and showing, in opposition to Dr. Channing and other Unitarians, that the personal distinctions do not contradict the truth of divine unity, he proceeds to furnish the biblical evidence for the "plurality of persons in the Godhead;" and with this branch of the subject the whole book is chiefly occupied. It is very rich in scriptural quotations from the Old and New Testaments; and the "young student of divinity" will find it to be a valuable handbook in the prosecution of theological studies.

As the author tells us, the discussion is "plain and courteous;" to a great degree it is also "trustworthy." The argument is forcible; but it loses some force from a defective conception of the difference between the New Testament and the Old Testament. That God is Father and Son and Spirit, and that Son and Spirit as to nature are coordinate with the Father, are truths *peculiar* to *Christianity*. They are not taught in the Old Testament. Our author argues at some length from "the Angel," the "Angel of God," as represented in Jacob's dream, in the wrestling of Jacob with "a man," in the blessing of Jacob pronounced on Joseph, and in the manifestation of God to Moses "in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush" (pp. 41-52) in support of the deity of Jesus Christ. The best exegesis and the best works on Old Testament biblical theology support the thought that the "Angel of the Lord" is a theophany, a transient human form of the Logos, and thus a significant type of the incarnate Son. This interpretation is in harmony with the preparatory, typical, and prefigurative character of pre-Christian revelation. If exegesis seeks to find in Genesis evidence of the Trinity on a par with Christian revelation, the argument will fail, and by association it may neutralize the adequate evidence of the New Testament. We may also instance a groundless inference drawn from Gen. iii. 15. Our author says that "the promise of a deliverer contemplated the birth of a virgin's Son." The promised One "was to be 'the seed of the woman' *alone*, the woman without connection with a man, Christ was most peculiarly 'the seed of the woman' as He had a human mother and no human father" (p. 67). It is unwarranted to reason in support of the miraculous conception of Jesus from the terms of the protevangel.

The author argues at great length and with much force from the New Testament in support of the "divinity" of Christ; but the legitimate force of the argument is weakened by its Nestorian trend. According to this method of reasoning, the two natures of Christ are associated, not members of an organic unity. Human attributes, human acts and experiences are predicated of the human nature, not of the God-man; transcendent authority, miracles and divine attributes are predicated of the divine nature, not of the personal unity. "Thus Jesus Christ as a man was known by men. As a man He is not present with His disciples; as a man He was killed by men; as a man He knew not the day and the hour of judgment. On the other hand, as God 'no man knoweth' Him; as God He is 'with' His disciples 'always;' as God no man took His life—He 'laid it down Himself;' as God He had appointed His own times for the judgment; hence must know both the day and the hour" (p. 138).

If the crucifixion must be predicated of the human nature only, if divinity in an external way supports the man on the cross, then we have only a human sacrifice for sin. Personality merely serves the purpose of holding the two natures together; and the doctrine respecting the deity of Christ has a precarious basis.

E. V. GERHART.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, REFORMED CHURCH, LANCASTER, PA.

PRIMARY DOCTRINES. Being Charges on Christian Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and on the Holy Spirit. By the late THOMAS HUBBARD VAIL, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Kansas. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 148, 12mo, 75 cents net.

The object of the author in these charges was to subject the received formularies of the Episcopal Church to a careful examination, in order to furnish a secure basis of agreement for those who are bound by them, relegating to speculation all unsettled questions which they suggest. This is a laudable design, and if controversy could be kept rigidly to these latter only, it would be better natured and quicker in reaching results of value. Few would dispute the author's definition of Christian baptism, as far as it goes. It is "the sacrament of the confession of Christ, of church-membership, of covenanted grace." It is only when he makes the last phrase identical in meaning with "the sacrament of regeneration" that one objects to the degradation of this latter word into a mere figurative expression. In the charge "on the Holy Spirit," he alludes to the controversies which have raged around this word, and its consequent ambiguity, and expresses the wish that permission for its disuse in the offices of the Church might be had. But certainly one ought not to fear a scriptural word; and there would be danger that in disusing the word we might lose whatever it means. It and its synonyms are too frequent in the New Testament for us to dare to run the risk. It is too carefully chosen a word, and its meaning too profound not to cover more than is signified in the phrase which the author makes to be its equivalent.

In his treatment of the Lord's Supper he makes its signification, too, to be threefold. It is a sacrament of the "memorial of Christ," "the covenant of Christ," "the communion with Christ." So far, too, none would disagree. Only some would contend for a wider meaning than the author gives to this last phrase, and that an extension of the meaning of the word "regeneration."

In the third charge a distinction is made between the *sanctifying* influences of the Holy Spirit and His *functional* gifts. Although the profounder problems in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit are untouched, yet this distinction is a valid and important one. From the *first* flows the admission that whatever is "good" is the work of the Holy Spirit; from which the corollary may be drawn that He bears a universal relation to humanity as such, and that all (moral) good whatever is only by virtue of this relation. From the *second* flows a doctrine of mediation. The fact of an authorized ministry, and of prescribed rites is implied and emphasized, and it is assumed that the Holy Spirit works through this mediation.

Although having little theologic depth, this volume will be useful in narrowing the region of controversy. It is calm and judicious within its own field. J. STEINFORT KEDNEY.

SEABURY DIVINITY SCHOOL, FARIBAULT, MINN.

MINOR NOTICES.

In the department of *Religious Fiction* the following books may be mentioned: *The Master of the Magicians*, by *Elizabeth Stuart Phelps* and *Herbert D. Ward* (her husband). (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., pp. 324, 16mo, $1.25.) This very clever book appeared a year ago, and attracted much attention. It is richly worth reading. It presents a picture of Babylon and of the life and manners there in the time of Daniel, which is probably archæologically correct and certainly extremely graphic. It is in the hope of inducing some who have not hitherto done so to buy this book and read it that this tardy notice is printed. The book should go into all our Sunday-school libraries, where it will do more good than many of the books now there.

A King of Tyre: A Tale of the Times of Ezra and Nehemiah, by *James M. Ludlow*. (New York: Harper, 12mo, pp. 298, $1.) Like the preceding book, this one may be commended for addition to Sunday-school libraries. The story itself is of considerable interest and the historical setting is well done and very accurate. We read the whole book almost at a single sitting, and found the interest well sustained throughout.

To the Lions: A Tale of the Early Christians, and *The Hammer: A Story of the Maccabean Times*, are the titles of two tales by Rev. *Alfred J. Church*, published in New York by G. P. Putnam's Sons; both adequately illustrated and well printed. In the second story Mr. Church has been aided by Mr. Richmond Seeley. Both stories are unqualifiedly recommended to committees of Sunday-schools now planning for Christmas. They are singularly instructive, as well as interesting. Mr. Church is a master of historic fiction. His scholarship is ample and his inventiveness unfailing.

Jabez Easterbrook: A Religious Novel, by *Joseph Hocking*. (London, New York, and Melbourne: Ward, Lock & Co., 12mo, pp. 362.) This is a story which has a strong family resemblance to the inimitable "Barriers Burned Away." This will be to most educated and refined persons strong condemnation. But Mr. Hocking is not quite so absurd as the late Mr. Roe. On the contrary, he has written a far more logical and possible story. Yet the same elements are used in its construction. A pious youth falls in love with a sceptical young woman of great wealth. She repulses him at first, but he is not lightly to be shaken off. He labors to convert her and is successful. Her heart goes out to her evangelist, and they are married. The literary flavor of the book is coarse and the story is on the whole trashy.

Leah of Jerusalem: A Story of the Time of Paul, by *Edward Payson Berry*. (New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d., 12mo, pp. 388, $1.) This story is pleasantly written, but, curiously enough, the parts in which Paul is introduced are decidedly inferior to the rest. Indeed, the difference between the speeches put in the mouth of Paul, except so far as they consist of quotations from the Acts and the Epistles, and those of the other characters is painful. If Paul had been left out entirely, the tale would be unqualifiedly praised as presenting a faithful and animated picture of the times. The scenes are laid in Jerusalem, in the wilderness of Judæa, and in Rome. There are many thrilling incidents.

A Dead Man's Diary Written after His Decease. (London, New York, and Melbourne: Ward, Lock & Co., pp. 218, $1.) This book appeared anonymously, but is now known to be the work of Mr. Coulson Kernahan, a writer of no note on this side of the sea. Its contents are a bit gruesome. It is supposed to be the experiences of one who temporarily was under the power of death, and since he had in early life committed a heinous offence, he feels the pains of hell in consequence. The author had really little to say, but by means of much padding managed to produce considerable "copy," which the publishers have put in coarse print, and thus assisted to make up a book of some size. The author has not materially helped his generation, although he has not injured it; indeed, his book is in parts decidedly clever.

The following volumes are of more substantial worth: *The Reformed Church in America*. Its Origin, Development, and Characteristics. By *David D. Demarest*, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology and Sacred Rhetoric in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J. (4th ed., revised and enlarged. New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America, 8vo, pp. xiii., 215.) The fact that this book is in its fourth edition may be taken as evidence of its adaptability to its purpose. It is, indeed, an admirable handbook for the Reformed Church in America, and should be in every family of that communion. The office-holders, both clerical and lay, should be familiar with its contents. The Reformed Church has a noble past and its present is worthy of study.

David Brainerd, the Apostle to the North American Indians, by *Jesse Page*. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co.) It was the making of Brainerd's reputation that he won the heart of Jonathan Edwards' daughter Jerusha, for that secured him the famous theologian as biographer, a circumstance to which his fame is to a large extent owing. The real pioneer of missionary work among the Indians (in New York State among the

Mohawks, 1642–91), a hundred years before Brainerd, was Joannes Megapolensis, but few ever heard of him, for he had no biographer. And still more obscure are the French Jesuit missionaries, who for the sake of their Holy Church exhibited a heroism which puts John Eliot and David Brainerd to the blush. The efforts of the latter seem child's play and dilettante in comparison. Of this book it will be sufficient to say that it is intelligently written, is based throughout upon Brainerd's journal, from which each of his biographers have drawn, and gives a good idea of his short but useful and spiritual life. Those who desire further information are referred by the reviewer, not by Mr. Page, who does not mention any other books, to Rev. Dr. J. M. Sherwood's edition of Rev. Dr. S. E. Dwight's edition of Jonathan Edwards' original Life of Brainerd, published by Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1884, 12mo, $1.50.

Talks with Ralph Waldo Emerson, by *Charles J. Woodbury.* (New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 18mo, pp. 177.) Mr. Woodbury has written what is on the whole an excellent little book. His style is somewhat grandiloquent at times. He has a fondness for using out-of-the-way words, such as "abstersion" (p. 129), "confecting people" (p. 131), "lemurs" (p. 174). But the enthusiastic regard for Emerson is pleasant to find. The book is primarily written for young men. It is dedicated "To the youth of the land who aspire." It embodies conversations held with Emerson between 1865 and 1870, when Mr. Woodbury was himself a young man. All that he gives us of Emerson's talk is precious. Some of the anecdotes about Emerson are very amusing, as, for instance, the college students' surprise at their honored guest eating such "dainties" as "ice cream and comfits," with an appetite they had supposed "characteristic only of undergraduates," and that in face of the fact that Emerson had in his published writings forbidden those same dainties, "except for those who dare not trust the entertainment of their own minds" (p. 167). The book gives a good idea of the impression Emerson made upon young and ardent natures. His gospel of independence stirred their pulses and gave a direction upward to their thoughts. Many of his criticisms upon his contemporaries were shrewd and all were kindly. And so we thank Mr. Woodbury for having been at the pains to copy them from the journal in which they were originally jotted down. But surely Mr. Woodbury goes too far in his hero-worship when he attributes sinlessness to Emerson, as when he says, "he was a pilgrim of the invisible, and both by heritage and growth without the capacity of sin" (p. 115). Alas! the best of us has that. But that Emerson was a pure and lofty soul, who exhaled the fragrance of a God-filled nature, we joyfully acknowledge.

Isaac and Jacob: their Lives and Times. (New York: Randolph, 12mo, pp. viii., 186.) We have here a late addition to the "Men of the Bible Series," by *George Rawlinson.* It is to be regretted that the author is not aware of much that other men have learned from the processes of that much-abused science, "Higher Criticism." The exuberance of the author's imagination, however, is remarkable, and for a literary setting out of the scenes of biblical story the book may be recommended. But of fact as over against fancy, one may get as much in smaller space without the aid of this volume from Genesis. It may be said that the book is intended for the ordinary reader, but that will not excuse such antiquated views as those here presented; for instance, that with regard to the location of the land of Goshen (p. 168). Either the book itself is much older than its imprint, or the author is far behind the times.

What of Samuel? by *James Morris Whiton*, Ph.D., minister of Trinity Congregational Church in New York (London: James Clarke & Co.; imported by Thomas Whittaker, New York. p. 8vo, pp. vi., 80; paper, 40 cents) is the title of a little book which proposes to give an account of Samuel, the prophet, the founder of the Schools of the Prophets, and the king-making politician. Of biographical material there is very little, but of glimpses into the working of his mind, as viewed by the author, there are many. The author's standpoint is at a great remove from the ordinary one in regard to inspiration, and he brings out clearly some of the moral difficulties in the way of an inspiration which would make God responsible for many things which shock the moral sense of men to-day. The explanation given of the incident of the witch of Endor is the only one which is reasonable and at the same time satisfactory, though scarcely new.

Students of antiquities connected with Egypt and Assyria have long known the series of books constituting the "Records of the Past." After an interval of several years since the cessation of the publication, a new series has been projected under the editorship of Professor *A. H. Sayce.* The title is *Records of the Past; being English Translations of the Ancient Monuments of Egypt and Western Asia.* (London: Bagster, vols. i.–ii. 12mo, pp. xii., 175; ix., 208.) A number of changes are to be noted in connection with the appearance of this new series, which, however, is not so "new" that it contains no documents known to the former volumes. A few have been retranslated, and one cannot but be struck by the changes which have been made in the text, due to very material advances in the more exact grammatical knowledge of the languages from which the translations were made. A great improvement is to be noted in that the introductory remarks concerning the various pieces are fuller and more detailed than previously. The notes are more numerous and give much more information and more of detail than formerly. In exterior appearance the two series are precisely alike, but the arrangement by which the odd volumes contain only Assyrian or Babylonian texts, while those with even numbers contain nothing but Egyptian, has been abandoned. As specimens we have examined one of the documents which is repeated in the new series, and have found it so changed that it scarcely seems to represent the same original. Another we have compared with a copy of the original made by the writer directly from the Berlin papyrus. In general the translation is correct, except that in many cases the vice of such translations is evident in the desire to give a readable rendering even where the original is too doubtful to allow of certainty, or where our present knowledge will not allow us to go beyond mere conjecture. Attention may be called to what is an undoubted error in vol. ii., p. 20, where "Edima" (Edom?) is the form given to a geographical name which properly begins with a *Q.* New translations of the creation stories, the new Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and specimens of Assyrian correspondence are among the recent material added in the present series. A remark of Mr. Pinches (ii., p. 181) may be quoted as applicable to all translations like these: "Though the sense of the whole is pretty clear, the translation will probably be still further improved as time goes on."

QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

The Andover Review, Oct., 1891.

In "An Advance Step in Sunday-School Bible Study," Rev. Erastus Blakeslee, Spencer, Mass., gives an account of the relation between the new Outline Inductive Bible Studies and the old International Lessons, announces the formation of The Bible Study Union, with The Bible Study Publishing Company, Boston, Mass., as its business managers; and concludes with the second series of the Outline Inductive Bible Studies—"The Apostolic Church." "The Cherokee Outlet," by D. W. C. Duncan, Esq., Tahlequah, I. T., is a protest on moral and legal grounds against the opening up by the Government of the Cherokee outlet for white settlement. Then follows the second part, "Ecclesiasticism," of the article "Criticism *versus* Ecclesiasticism," by Rev. Stewart Means, New Haven, Conn. It shows how the inrush of new life by the fall of Napoleon and the establishment of peace caused in the Church of England a merely retrograde movement, ending in ritualism, "a kind of bastard Romanism." "Is Christ Himself the Sufficient Creed of Christianity?" by Professor Gulliver, Andover, Mass., is a review and commendatory exposition of Rev. Alexander McKenzie's "Christ Himself;" and in "The Authority of the Pulpit in a Time of Critical Research and Social Confusion," Professor Tucker, Andover, Mass., discusses with great circumspection and considerable pungency the question how the authority of the pulpit can be vindicated without ignoring present issues or meeting inquiry with dogmatism.

The Theological Monthly, London, Oct., 1891.

In the opening article, "The Question of Inspiration," by Robert Watts, D.D., the author clears away certain misconceptions of the idea of plenary inspiration, which sometimes lead to the denial of the fact on account of ignorance of its inner nature, sometimes to confounding verbal inspiration with verbal dictation, and sometimes to making inspiration and revelation one and the same thing; after which he demonstrates the bearing of the true doctrine of inspiration on the doctrine of grace. Then follow Part IV. of "Ecce Christianus," by J. P. Lilley, moving from the consideration of what it is to be a Christian to a consideration of the way in which men are to be persuaded to enter on the Christian life; Part IV. of "Philosophy and Religion," by Edward Naville, demonstrating that, though on account of a feeling of pious awe it is difficult to a Christian to subject the contents of his faith to the searching light of science, it is as difficult to the philosopher who is a stranger to faith to apply that light to the Christian dogma, and that from sheer prejudice, which, willing though he is to study any doctrine of Aristotle or Hegel, makes him utterly unwilling to examine a doctrine which has changed the face of the moral world, solely because it is Christian; and Part II. of "Inspired Hebrew Poetry," by James Neil, treating of that large portion of Hebrew poetry in which the verse is not used. The "Jonathan," by F. G. Cholmondeley, is a study of the germs of chivalry or chivalrous ideas found in the Old Testament.

The Unitarian Review, Oct. 1891.

"The Church Service," by Rev. James Vila Blake, Chicago, Ill., sets forth the principles which, after eight years of experience, have come to rule in the service and ritual of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago. After "Emerson as a Poet," by Frank P. Stearns, follows "Influences Bearing upon Christian Thought in Japan," a commencement oration delivered in Cambridge by Nariaki Kozaki, from which it appears that the importation of the scientific spirit of European civilization drives away not only ghosts, imps, and demons, and also leads to confusion of ideas respecting duty, God, and hope; but, happily, it also appears that Christianity in its simplest and most effective form—Christianity not as a creed, but as a moral agent—finds the field quite ready for it. The "Henry Giles," by A. Judson Rich, is a character sketch, full of life and significance.

The Old and New Testament Student, Oct., 1891.

The second part of "The Modern Jew and his Synagogue," by Rev. Professor T. W. Davies, B.D., Haverfordwest Baptist College, South Wales, gives a description of the fasts and feasts of the month Tishri, such as the author saw them celebrated in London. "The Self-Consciousness of Jesus in its Relation to the Messianic Hope," by Rev. Albert W. Hitchcock, Berlin, proposes to employ the same method as would be employed in the study of the self-consciousness of any other genius who from the common human activity rose into a historical mission, and gives in its present first part an exposition and criticism of the various theories, rationalistic and supranaturalistic, from which others have started. Under the title "The Bible in English Life and Letters," Rev. J. T. McClure, D.D., Lake Forest, Ill., will give in three papers a succinct survey of the effect which the Bible has had upon England and upon all life influenced by England, a topic often touched upon by English writers, but never before, as far as we know, made the subject of a comprehensive review. In "The End of the World" Rev. Benjamin Wisner Bacon, Oswego, N. Y., makes a sharp distinction between the Rabbinic and the Christian idea of the kingdom of God, and discards as purely figurative the Judaistic eschatological element from the New Testament representation of the consummation of all things. Then follow "The Gospel of John" (xv. 1–xvi. 33), by William R. Harper and George S. Goodspeed, and "An Exposition on Biblical Grounds of 1 Cor. xv. 24–28," by Rev. J. Dyck, Sodus, N. Y., both of expository and homiletic character; finally, notes and notices.

The New Englander and Yale Review, Oct., 1891.

"The so-called Labor Problem," by Albert Mathews, New York City, is a very sharp, but at many points hitting criticism of the present phase of the problem and its treatment. "An Untouched Field for Missionary Labor," by Linton Satterthwait, Trenton, N. J., has a similar tendency, but a different character. Critically, it is directed against a generation of voters which has been taught that in politics everything is fair; positively it demands the application of the commonest rules of morality to politics. "The two Specially Critical Periods in the Life of the Young," by A. S. Chesebrough, Saybrook, Conn., with respect to the laying of the foundations of moral and religious character, refer to the beginning and the close of child-life, the first period covering the first three or four years and the second the age of puberty. Articles IV. and VI. are reviews of John F. Genung's translation of the Book of Job by D. H. Chamberlain, New York City, and of Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of the World," by Thomas

R. Bacon, Berkeley, Cal. In "Enthusiasm for the Ministry," George A. Gordon, Boston, Mass., shows whence the ministry of the Gospel can and should draw its enthusiasm and its inspirations; and in "Prayer in a Universe of Law," Edward S. Parsons, Greeley, Col., maintains against Herbert Spencer and others that the accomplishment of all results in the universe by forces perfectly under the rule of law is no evidence whatsoever that such results are not the response of the divine free will to the prayer of a needy man.

The Expositor, London, Oct., 1891.

"The Prophet Jeremiah," by Rev. Professor A. Duff, is a study of his development in thought and utterance. By "The Fourfold Revelation of God" Professors H. M. Gwatkin, Cambridge, means the revelation of God in nature, Scripture, history, and life. "On the Moral Character of Pseudonymous Books" (article II.), by Rev. Professor J. S. Candlish, Glasgow, discusses some of those pious frauds to which Jewish and Christian literature has been subjected, beginning with the Wisdom of Solomon. "The Pure Word in the Foul Plot," by Rev. Samuel Cox, is an exhortation to be "swift to hear and slow to speak," and an exposition of the psychological connection between this clause and the one which follows immediately, "slow to wrath." Then follow "Candidates for Discipleship," by Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, "Note on *λογισμοί*," by Rev. J. Llewellyn Davies, and "Zechariah," by Rev. Professor W. G. Elmslie, all of which are of expository or homiletic character.

The Newbery House Magazine, Oct., 1891.

"The Church Congress," by Rev. Morris Fuller, treats of the origin, purpose, principles, etc., of church congresses. Then follow "Sermon Outlines," by the editor, contributions of fiction, and "Germs and Disease," by Arthur A. Lynch. "Some Typographical Survivals," by Isaac Taylor, gives a number of curious illustrations of that system of abbreviation which was practised by mediæval scribes, and of which many traces are still to be found in the printed books of our days. "Bell Inscriptions," by J. Cuthbert Hadden, has a mingled antiquarian and poetical interest which makes it very pleasant reading. The illustrations of the number are interesting, especially those in the article "Childhood in Art," by Theodore Child.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Review (Quarterly), Nashville, Tenn., Oct., 1891.

The opening article, "History of Infant Baptism," by Rev. Professor J. D. Kirkpatrick, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., is, as the title shows, not so much a discussion of the doctrine of the Church as a view of its history. "The Vocation to the Ministry," by Rev. P. G. Rea, Marshall, Mo., is an exposition of the authority, importance, difficulties, and delights of the ministry. "Propitiation and not Expiation," by Rev. B. G. Mitchell, Oxford, Miss., is a discussion of the terms used in the New and Old Testament in connection with this doctrine, as "Substitution, Mediation, Atonement," by Rev. J. W. Wood, Mattoon, Ill., is a discrimination between terms, based upon the relation between the Edenic period and the Gospel dispensation. "The Home Library," by Rev. J. D. Gold, Columbia, Tenn., is a plea for the library as something as necessary to a home as carpets and furniture, and gives suitable points for its formation. "The Gospel Preached by the Apostle Paul," by Rev. M. L. Gordon, Andover, Mass., puts the question, whether the Christ "on whom we rest all our hopes" is the true historical Christ or something of a phantasma built up and changed by tradition. "Should the Trinity be in a Creed?" by Rev. John Miller, Princeton, N. J., first defines what a creed should be, and then goes on to answer the question. "Heresy Fifty Years Ago," by Rev. Robert Hood, Glasgow, Scotland, relates to the trial of Rev. James Morison in Glasgow. "Elements of Spiritual Power," by Rev. Professor D. S. Bodenhamer, Trinity University, Tehuacana, Texas, distinguishes between spiritual power and merely mental power, and analyzes the former as a combination of faith, moral courage, and knowledge of God's Word under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The Sunday Magazine, Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Oct., 1891.

"The Legacy of Love," by the Lord Bishop of Ripon, is a homily, and a beautiful one, on the words "Woman, behold thy son" (John xix. 26). "Christ's Hospital and its Sons," by Rev. E. H. Pearce, gives a survey of Christ's Hospital, its history, archæology, organization, etc., but not so much for the sake of that history, archæology, etc., as on account of the lesson which the institution teaches as a part of human life. "Henry Martyn," by Rev. Henry Montagu Butler, is a sermon preached in Trinity Church, Cambridge, on the first and the last texts on which Henry Martyn preached as curate of that church. In "The Great Salt Lake City and its People," Mr. William C. Preston gives his impression of that place, its looks, its history, its meaning.

Good Words, London, Oct., 1891.

Beside its instalments of fiction by Mrs. Oliphant, M. B. Tweedie, and J. M. Barrie, the number includes "Ancient Mosaics," by Mrs. Lecky, a well-illustrated and very instructive piece; "Off the Beaten Track," an interesting blending of nature-description and church history, with the *insula sacra* of Bede as its centre; "Painter and Preacher," by James Stalker, D.D.; "Cowper and his Localities," by Rev. Canon Benham, etc. The "Questions of the Christian Life," by the Lord Bishop of Winchester, are homilies on the words "Why sleep ye?" "But why dost thou judge thy brother?" "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" and "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?"

The Missionary Review, New York, Nov. 1891.

The article "The Causes of the Disturbance in China," by J. T. Gracey, will be read at this moment with special interest, giving, as it does, much new information. As one of the principal causes of the disturbance it mentions the pensioned army. When the Taiping rebellion was finally put down, the Chinese Government found an army of about one million soldiers on its hands. In order to effect a peaceful dissolution of this army, it was pensioned; but though a generation has passed away since that time, the number of pensioned soldiers has not decreased; and these men, living in idleness at the expense of the public treasury, have generally taken up a roving life, and have become the rallying points, leaders, and instigators of all kinds of popular discontent. Other interesting articles in the number are "Missions to the Iberian Peoples," by J. M. Challis, D.D., Santiago, Chili, and not only to the peoples of the Iberian peninsula, Spain and Portugal, but also to the population of the vast colonies formed in South and Central America by those two peoples; "The Languages of Nyasaland in Relation to the Spread of the Word of God," by W. A. Elmslie, Livingstonia Mission; "The Relation of Money to the Progress of Christ's Kingdom," by Rev. W. D. Sexton, Hillsdale, Mich., etc.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT PERIODICALS.

Harper's Magazine for November has these contents: Frontispiece—"And she frankly Told her Passion"—illustration for "The Inn of the Good Woman;" "The Inn of the Good Woman," a Thanksgiving-day story, by Hezekiah Butterworth, with eight illustrations, including frontispiece; "Cairo in 1890," Part II., by Constance Fenimore Woolson, with fourteen illustrations: the ancient university of Cairo, El Azhar, the Splendid; scenes in an Egyptian apartment-house; the Khan of Kait Bey; a horse-race; the dancing-dervishes; the Mohammedan at his prayers; sights from the Citadel of Cairo; the palace of Gezireh; the character and career of Ismail Pasha; the present Khedive; difficulties in the way of understanding Oriental nations; the East the land of mystery; farewell to Cairo; "Call not Pain's Teaching Punishment," a poem, by Amélie Rives; "Peter Ibbetson," a novel, Part VI., by George du Maurier, with fourteen illustrations by the author—the conclusion of this remarkable and powerful story; "Dan Dunn's Outfit," by Julian Ralph, with ten illustrations by Frederic Remington—scenes and characters in a railroad camp in British Columbia; how a railroad is built through the wilderness; frontier types; "Letters of Charles Dickens to Wilkie Collins," Part III., edited by Laurence Hutton—familiar correspondence from 1862 to 1870, covering the last eight years of Dickens's life; "November—Impression," a poem, by William Dean Howells; "Stonewall Jackson," by Rev. Henry M. Field, D.D., with eleven illustrations from drawings by Charles Graham and F. V. DuMond—a valuable paper, based largely upon hitherto unpublished facts contained in Mrs. Jackson's forthcoming biography of her distinguished husband; "The Unspoken Word," a poem, by Eliza Calvert Hall; "The Treatment of Cancers and other Tumors," by B. Farquhar Curtis, M.D., and William T. Bull. M.D.; "Africa, and the European Powers," by Arthur Silva White, F.R.S.E., with map showing the comparative value of African lands; "The Widder Johnsing," a story, by Ruth McEnery Stuart; "The London of Good Queen Bess," by Walter Besant, with ten illustrations—the London of Queen Elizabeth a city of ruins; the beginning of a new era; an Elizabethan house; the merchants; the grammar schools; the poets and dramatists; amusements; theatres; rogues, vagabonds, and cheats; cruel punishments; social life in the city; "Perils of Speculation," full-page illustration by George du Maurier; "Editor's Easy Chair," by George William Curtis; "Editor's Study," by William Dean Howells; "Editor's Drawer," conducted by Charles Dudley Warner; "Monthly Record of Current Events" (to September 14, 1891).

The Century for November has these contents: "Delphian Sibyl" and "Cumæan Sibyl," by Michelangelo, engraved by T. Cole, frontispieces; "Michelangelo Buonarotti," Italian old Masters, W. J. Stillman, engravings and notes by T. Cole; "Izaak Walton." from a painting by George H. Boughton; "Southern Womanhood as Affected by the War," Wilbur Fisk Tillett; "A Great German Artist—Adolf Menzel," Carl Marr, pictures by Adolf Menzel; "The Players," Brander Matthews, pictures by A. Brennan; "India," Florence Earle Coates; "The Naulahka," I., Rudyard Kipling and Wolcott Balestier; "Sursum Corda," Edith M. Thomas; "What are Americans Doing in Art?" F. D. Millet; "The Hunger-Strike," Elizabeth W. Fiske; "How Old Folks Won the Oaks," J. J. Eakins, pictures by H. Helmick; "Brontë," Harriet Prescott Spofford; "The Autobiography of a Justice of the Peace," Edgar W. Nye, pictures by E. W. Kemble; "Mazzini's Letters to an English Family," edited by Stephen Pratt, Joseph Mazzini; "In the Pauses of her Song," Orelia Key Bell; "A Rival of the Yosemite," King's River Cañon, John Muir, pictures by the author and Charles D. Robinson; "A Theft Condoned," Gertrude Smith; "A Song for all Seasons," James Herbert Morse; "The Food-Supply of the Future," W. O. Atwater; "Folksong," Sylvester Baxter; "The Sonnet," Edith Wharton; "James Russell Lowell," George E. Woodberry; "Lowell's Americanism," Joel Benton, with a letter from James Russell Lowell, with Portrait; "The Major's Appointment," Julia Schayer, pictures by C. D. Gibson; "The Choice," Owen Innsly; "Music," A. Lampman; "San Francisco Vigilance Committees," by the Chairman of the Committees 1851, 1856, and 1877, William T. Coleman; "Topics of the Time:" "Lowell's Legacy to his Country;" "Michigan's 'Wild-cat' Banks;" "Corrupt Practices Legislation in 1891;" "An American Achievement in Art;" "Open Letters:" "California's Interest in Yosemite Reform," George G. Mackenzie; "A Roman Catholic's View of 'Sister Dolorosa,'" L. H.; "The Paris Opera," A. Vianesi; "George H. Boughton," M. G. Van Rensselaer; "In Lighter Vein:" "Kitty, My Colleen," P. J. Coleman; "The Prophets," C. P. Stetson; "Brer Fox," E. A. Oldham; "Grace after Meat," Margaret Vandegrift; "Ho for the Desert!" G. E. de Steigver; "My Old Skippers," C. H. Webb; "The New Street-Sweeper," G. Towner.

Scribner's Magazine for November has these contents: "Evening Colors," frontispiece, the United States Naval Apprentice System, drawn by R. F. Zogbaum, engraved by R. Varley; "Explorations in the Sierra Madre," by Carl Lumholtz, illustrations by Herbert Denman, E. E. Thompson, W. L. Metcalf, C Broughton, J. Reich, and E. W. Deming; engraving by Varley, C. I. Butler, and Van Ness; "The Federation of Australia," by the Hon. Alfred Deakin, M.P., of Victoria, one of the Delegates to the National Australasian Convention; "In November," by Duncan Campbell Scott; "The United States Naval Apprentice System," by A. B. Wyckoff, Lieutenant U. S. Navy, illustrations by R. F. Zogbaum; engraving by Pettit, Witte, and M. J. Whaley; "The Wrecker"—Chapters X.-XI., by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne (begun in August, to be continued), with a full-page illustration by William Hole; "The Ocean Steamship as a Freight Carrier," by John H. Gould, the sixth article in the series on Ocean Steamships, illustrations by O. H. Bacher, M. J. Burns, C. Broughton, and V. Pérard; engraving by Andrew; "A Recognition," by Octave Thanet; "Dolorosa," by William Vaughn Moody; "The Picturesque Quality of Holland," figures and costumes, by George Hitchcock, illustrations by George Hitchcock, engraving by John P. Davis, Pettit, Witte, and J. F. Juengling; "The Proposed Trans-Saharian Railway," by Napoléon Ney, illustrations by J. H. Twachtman, V. Gribayedoff, and W. C. Fitler; engraving by Pettit and M. J. Whaley; "Song from 'Ayuna,'" by Julian Hawthorne; "Mr. Lowell as a Teacher;" "The Auction;" "Adventures among Books," second paper, by Andrew Lang; "The Point of View:" Mr. Lowell in Anti-slavery Days; The Safety of Buildings; Vapor that Vanisheth; Unimproved Chances of Self-assertion.

Lippincott's Magazine for November has these contents: "The Duke and the Commoner," by Mrs. Poultney Bigelow; "On the State of the Tide," by F Arnold; "The Tettix," by Clinton Scollard; "Some Colonial Love-letters," by Anne H. Wharton; "Two Songs," by Harrison S. Morris; "The Return of the Rejected," by Octave Thanet; "Association Foot-ball," by Frederick Wier; "Shadow and Substance," by Barton Hill; "Sorrow," by Henry Peterson; "The Evolution of Money and Finance," by J. Howard Cowperthwait; "The Restoration of Silver," by John A. Grier; "An Interviewer Interviewed—a Talk with George Alfred Townsend;" "Modern American Humor," by William S. Walsh; "With the Wits." (Illustrated by leading artists.)

Littell's Living Age. The numbers of *The Living Age* for October 10th and 17th contain "The System of the Stars," *Edinburgh Review*; "The Story of a Violin," *Macmillan's Magazine*; "Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury," *Blackwood's Magazine*; "Some Famous Pirates," *National Review*; "Life in an Algerian Hill-Town," *Gentleman's Magazine*; "A Noble Mother," *Leisure Hour*; "Rousseau's Ideal Household," *National Review*; "Tennyson's Lincolnshire Farmers: A Retrospect," *Westminster Review*; "Note on a New Poet," *Fortnightly Review*; "Mrs. Carlyle's Town," *Spectator*; "St. Paul and the Roman Law," *Contemporary Review*; "Heera Nund," *Macmillan's Magazine*: "Irish Bulls, and Bulls not Irish," *Temple Bar*; "Laurence Oliphant," *Scottish Review*; "A Remembrance," *New Review*; "On the Relation of Painter's 'Palace of Pleasure' to the English Romantic Drama," *Fortnightly Review*; "High Life," *Cornhill Magazine*; "Flowers and the Poets," *Gentleman's Magazine*; "Rebecca and her Daughters," *Leisure Hour*; "Persia under the Present Shah," *Asiatic Quarterly Review*; "The Bridge of the Hundred Spans," *Good Words*; together with poetry and miscellany.

The Atlantic Monthly for November has these contents: "The Lady of Fort St. John," XVI.-XVIII., and Postlude, Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "Count Tolstóy at Home," Isabel F. Hapgood; "A November Prairie," Katharine T. Prescott; "The Chief City of the Province of the Gods," Lafcadio Hearn; "A Trumpet Call," E. Cavazza; "E-lim-in-ah-do," Clinton Scollard; "James Clarence Mangan," Louise Imogen Guiney; "The Chaperon," in two parts, part first, Henry James; "The Schools at Oxford," S. E. Winbolt; "Beyond the Day," John Vance Cheney; "A People without Law," II., James Bradley Thayer; "Journalism and Literature," W. J. Stillman; "Two French Men of Letters," "The Gods in Greece," "Comment on New Books," "The Contributors' Club."

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, October, 1891.

An Advance Step in Sunday-School Bible Study. Rev. E. Blakeslee.
The Cherokee Outlet. D. W. C. Duncan, Esq.
Criticism *versus* Ecclesiasticism. II Ecclesiasticism. Rev. Stewart Means.
Is Christ Himself the Sufficient Creed of Christianity? Prof. Gulliver.
The Authority of the Pulpit in a Time of Critical Research and Social Confusion. Prof. Tucker.

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW.

Boston and London, October, 1891.

The Church Service. James Vila Blake.
Emerson as a Poet. Frank P. Stearns.
Influences bearing upon Christian Thought in Japan. Nariaki Kozaki.
Henry Giles. A. Judson Rich.
Unitarianism as History. The Editor.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., October, 1891.

The Modern Jew and his Synagogue. II. Rev. Prof. T. W. Davies, B.D.
The Self-Consciousness of Jesus in its Relation to the Messianic Hope. I. Rev. Albert W. Hitchcock.
The Bible in English Life and Letters. I. Rev. J. T. McClure, D.D.
The End of the World. Rev. Benjamin Wisner Bacon.
The Gospel of John. William R. Harper and George S. Goodspeed.
An Exposition on Biblical Grounds of 1 Cor. xv. 24–28. Rev. J. Dyck.

THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

London, October, 1891.

The Question of Inspiration. R. Watts, D.D.
Ecce Christianus. IV. J. P. Lilley.
Philosophy and Religion. IV. Edward Naville.
Inspired Hebrew Poetry. II. J. Neil.
Jonathan. F. G. Cholmondeley.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

The so-called Labor Problem. Albert Mathews.
An Untouched Field for Missionary Labor. Linton Satterthwait.
The two Specially Critical Periods in the Life of the Young. A. S. Chesebrough.
Geming's Job, or "The Epic of the Inner Life" D. H. Chamberlain.
Enthusiasm for the Ministry. Geo. A. Gordon.
Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of the World." Thomas R. Bacon.
Prayer in a Universe of Law. Edward S. Parsons.

THE MISSIONARY HERALD.

Boston, October, 1891.

Sketch of Marsovan Station, Western Turkey. Rev. George F. Herrick, D.D.
The Disturbances in China.
The New Encyclopædia of Missions.
Russia and Gospel Work in the Caucasus. Rev. William N. Chambers.
Education at Harpoot, Eastern Turkey. Rev. H. N. Barnum.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, October, 1891.

The Prophet Jeremiah. Rev. Prof. A. Duff, M.A., LL.D.
The Fourfold Revelation of God. Prof. H. M. Gwatkin, M.A.
The Moral Character of Pseudonymous Books. Rev. Prof. J. S. Candlish, D.D.
The Pure Word in the Foul Plot. Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D.
Candidates for Discipleship. Rev. Prof. Marcus Dods, D.D.
Note on λογισμοί, in 2 Cor. x. Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies.
Zechariah. Rev. Prof. W. G. Elmslie, D.D.

THE NEWBERY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, October, 1891.

The Church Congress. Rev. Morris Fuller, B.D.
Are High Churchmen Disloyal? H. Ormonde.
"No Compromise" (chaps. x.–xiii.). By Helen F. Hetherington and Rev. H. Darwin Burton, A.M.
The Rocks of Tregarthen. Eleanor Towle.
Germs and Disease. Arthur A. Lynch.
Childhood in Art. Theodore Child.
Some Typographical Survivals. Canon Isaac Taylor.
Bell Inscriptions. J. Cuthbert Hadden.
The Song of the Axe. Frederic E. Weatherly.
The Birthplace of England's Earliest Bard. Rev. J. W. Southern, M.A.

OUR DAY.

Boston, October, 1891.

May the United States Intercede for the Jews? Rev. W. E. Blackstone.
Crimes against Working Girls. Rev. L. Albert Banks.
Sunday Closing of the World's Fair. Rev. W. F. Crafts.
Seen from Beyond. Pres. J. E. Rankin, D.D.
Boston Monday Lectures—16th year.—Modern Science and the Resurrection.—Can Apparitions be Photographed? Joseph Cook.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

Quarterly, Nashville, Tenn., October, 1891.

History of Infant Baptism. Rev. Prof. J. D. Kirkpatrick, D.D.
The Vocation to the Ministry. Rev. P. G. Rea.
Propitiation and not Expiation. Rev. B. G. Mitchell.
The Home Library. Rev. J. D. Gold.
Substitution, Mediation, Atonement. Rev. J. W. Wood.
Co-Education. Prof. L. A. Johnson.
The Gospel, Preached by the Apostle Paul. Rev. M. L. Gordon, D.D.
The Invincible Book. Rev. J. H. Piper.
Woman's Past and Future. Prof. J. I. D. Hinds, Ph.D.
Should the Trinity be in a Creed? Rev. John Miller.
Character Determines Destiny. Rev. T. A. Cowan.
Elements of Spiritual Powers. Rev. Prof. D. S. Bodenhamer.

THE SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

London, October, 1891.

Godiva Durleigh (chaps. xxxiv.–xxxvi.). Sarah Doudney.
The Legacy of Love. The Lord Bishop of Ripon (W. B. Carpenter, D.D.).
Christ's Hospital and its Sons. Rev. E. H. Pearce, M.A.
A Strange Service. Mrs. Charles Garnett.
While-You-Wait. The Riverside Visitor.
A Night in a Yesidi Village. Michael A. Morrison.
The People and the People's Palace. Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A.
On Lonely Hills (Conclusion). Mary Davison.
Henry Martyn. Rev. Dr. Butler.
The Great Salt Lake City. William C. Preston.
A High-born Roman Lady (Conclusion). E. W. Carter.
The Comforter. Mary Harrison.
Sunday Evenings with the Children. Mrs. G. C. Reaney.
Poetry.

GOOD WORDS.

London, October, 1891.

The Marriage of Elinor (chaps. xxxvii.–xl.). Mrs. Oliphant.
Ancient Mosaics. Mrs. Lecky.
Danger's Troubled Night (Conclusion). The Author of "Bretta."
Off the Beaten Track. Charles Blatherwick.
Painter and Preacher. James Stalker, D.D.
Cowper and his Localities. Rev. Canon Benham, B D.
Some Illustrations of English Thrift. Rev. Canon Blackley, M.A.
Forest Trees in Suburban Gardens. Charles W. Chapman, M.D.
The Wisdom of Don Quixote. Florence Maccann.
A House-Surgeon's Story. M. B. Tweedie.
The Little Minister (chaps. xxxvii.–xxxviii.).
Questions of the Christian Life. The Lord Bishop of Winchester (A. W. Thorold, D.D.)

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD.

New York, November, 1891.

Our Debt, our Duty, and our Destiny. Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D.
The Relation of Money to the Progress of Christ's Kingdom. Rev. W. D. Sexton.
The Languages of Nyasa-Land (British Central Africa) in Relation to the Spread of the Word of God W. A. Elmslie.
A Missionary Prayer. Rev. J. F. B. Tinling.
Rev. L. H. Gulick, D.D. Rev. S. P. Leeds.
Foreign Missions from the Standpoint of Art. Rev. W. B. Green, D.D.
The Carey Epoch in Missions. Rev. D. L. Leonard.
The Melanesian Mission. Rev. Robert Steel, D.D.
Congregationalists and Missions. Rev. Edward Storrow.
A New Application of an Old Hymn. Paul V. Bowmar.
Nam Thang Song. Rev. F. Ellis.
Cuba as a Mission Field. W. J. Moman.
The Protestant Movement in Mexico. Eleanor P. Allen.
Extracts and Translations from Foreign Periodicals. Rev. C. C. Starbuck.
International Department. Edited by Rev. J. T. Gracey, D.D.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

Richmond, Va., October, 1891.

Calvinism and Confessional Revision. A. Kuyper, D.D.
The Universal Book. J. B. Shearer, D.D., LL.D.
Inspiration of the Scriptures. John Pym Carter, D.D.
The Study of the Bible in the Original Languages. W. M. McPheeters, D.D.
Calvinism; and Calvinism and Infant Salvation. W. L. Nourse, D.D.
Notes: Some Alleged Discrepancies between the Books of Chronicles and Kings. Lewis B. Paton.
Closed Questions. Robt. A. Webb, D.D.
The Christian Endeavor Movement. James Lewis Howe, Ph.D.
Criticisms and Reviews.

METHODIST REVIEW.

New York, November-December, 1891.

The Genesis of the New Testament, with a few Words respecting Higher Criticism. Prof. L. T. Townsend, S.T.D.

Recent Missionary Discussions. Bishop J. M. Thoburn, D.D.

Pantheism and Cognition. Prof. C. M. Moss, Ph.D.

Pre-Adamites. Rev. Henry Colman, S.T.D.

Pronouns. Rev. Henry Graham, D D.

Mental and Moral Characteristics of Martin Luther. Rev. W. N. McElroy, D.D.

Regeneration as a Force in Reform Movements. Rev. C. M. Morse.

Editorial Notes and Discussions.

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW.

Philadelphia, Pa., October, 1891.

Eternal Retribution. Samuel H. Kellogg.

Simon Peter in the School of Christ. George T. Purves.

Hypothesis and Dogma in the Sciences. Charles W. Shields.

The "New Psychology" D. W. Fisher.

The Prophecies of Balaam. Lewis B. Paton.

The Vocabulary of the New Testament. J. Ritchie Smith.

The International Missionary Union. John L Nevius.

The General Synod of the Reformed Church in America. Talbot W. Chambers.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. William Caven.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York, November, 1891.

Eugène Bersier. Rev. Prof. Wm. C. Wilkinson, D.D.

The Ministry and Popular Education. Bishop John H. Vincent, D.D.

Serial Preaching. Rev. Prof. J. O. Murray, D.D.

How Can Economic Studies Help the Ministry? Rev. Pres. E. Benjamin Andrews, D.D., LL.D.

Some Thoughts on Liturgics. Prof. F. V. N. Painter.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Philadelphia, Pa., October, 1891.

The Relation of Humanity to Divinity. Pres. J. S. Stahr, Ph.D., D.D.

The Rennaissance and the Reformation. Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D.

A Retrospect—1791-1891. John Blair Linn, Esq.

The Liturgical Movement in the Scottish Kirk. Rev. Wm. Frederick Faber.

Divine Revelation. Rev. S. Z. Beam, D.D.

The Atonement Viewed from the Person of Christ. Rev. Hiram King, D.D.

Simon Bar-Jona: The Stone and the Rock. Mrs. T. C. Porter.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.

Bi-monthly, New York, October, 1891.

The Scientific and Social Law of Survival· Rev. William W. McLane, D.D.,Ph.D. (Remarks on Dr. McLane's paper, by Prof. G. Macloskie.)

The Children of Adam. S. D. McConnell, D.D.

The Origin and Power of Religious Ideas. Prof. M. J. Cramer, A.M., D.D.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

Gettysburg, Pa., 1891.

The Sacred Scriptures. Rev. Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph.D.

The Bible the World-Book. Rev. Prof. S. S. Rahn.

The General Question. Rev. J. M. Cromer.

Catechisation and Confirmation in the Lutheran Church. Rev. P. Bergstrasser, D.D.

The Joys of the Ministry. Rev. David H. Bauslin, D.D.

The Divine Formula for the Administration of the Lord's Supper. Rev. George H. Cox.

Status and Treatment of the Non-communing Adult Member. Rev. Charles C. Hay.

The Christian College. Rev. F. D. Altman.

The Evangelical Element in Catechisation. Rev. Adam Stump.

Our Debts—"our Trespasses." Rev. Prof. E. J. Wolf, D.D.

SUNDAY AT HOME.

London, October, 1891.

Marjorie's Trial (continued Story). Stanley J. Weyman.

Mrs. Timorous. Leslie Keith.

Thomas Valpy French, D.D., First Bishop of Lahore.

The Adoration of Buddha's Tooth (continued). Constance F. Gordon-Cumming.

Jews in London. Mrs. Brewer.

Heroes of the Goodwin Sands. Rev. T. Stanley Treanor.

The Fixed Heart. Lady Grisell Baillie.

Religious Life and Thought in Spain.

Westminster Abbey. Miss Bradley.

How Conviction was Wrought in Simon Peter. Rev. J. T. L. Maggs.

Sir Edward Baines. Rev. Eustace R. Conder, LL.D.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Achelis, E. Chr., Prof., Dr. Praktische Theologie. 2. Band, Liturgik. Die Lehre vom Gemeindegottesdienst. Die Lehre von den freien Vereinen. Kybernetik. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. xx , 540, 8vo, 11 mk.

Assyriologische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von Frdr. Delitzsch und Paul Haupt. 3. Band. 2. Abtheilung. 1. Lieferung. Inhalt: Das babylonische Nimrod-epos. Keilschrifttext der Bruchstücke der sogenannten Izdubar-legenden mit dem keilinschriftlichen Sintfluthberichte. Nach den Originalen im britischen Museum copirt und herausgegeben vot Prof. Dr. Paul Haupt. 2. Abtheilung. Der Keilschrifttexn der XI. und XII. Tafeln wie der seit 1882 neugefundenen oder vervollständigen Fragmente ertheilt. 1 Lieferung. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1891. Pp. 79-150, Nr. 43-72. (I., 1-4; II., III., 1, 2, 1; IV.-VI. und X., 332 mk.)

Baron, David. Rays of Messiah's Glory: or, Christ in the Old Testament. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 274, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Barrows, John H. The Gospels are True Histories. Boston: Lothrop, 1891. Pp. 146, 12mo, 75 cts.

Bender, H. Ueber das Wesen der Sittlichkeit und den natürlichen Entwickelungsprocess des sittlichen Gedankens. Kritische Studie. Halle a. S.: Pfeffer, 1891. Pp. vii., 127, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Berdoe, E. Browning's Message to his Time: His Religion, Philosophy and Science. 2d ed. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 178, 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Bergemann, P. Ernst Platner als Moralphilosoph und sein Verhältniss zur Kant'schen Ethik. Halle a. S.: Pfeffer, 1891. Pp. 56, 8vo, 1 mk.

Bernhardt, Wilhelm, Prof., Dr. Die Bannbulle Leo X. gegen Luther, nach dem Original-Text der im Lutherhause zu Wittenberg Ausgabe vom 17. Juli, 1520. Nebst der deutschen Uebersetzung. Wittenberg: Senf, 1891. Pp. 68, 16mo, 1 mk.

Besolow, Thomas E. From the Darkness of Africa to the Light of America. The story of an African Prince. New York: McLean, 1891. Pp. 160, 12mo, 50 cts.

Bewsher, M. E., Mrs. Mischief-Makers; or, The Story of Zipporah. A tale of the times of Herod the Great. London: Griffith, 1891. Pp. 334, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Bible. Libri Josuæ et Judicum Textum masoreticum accuratissime expressit, e fontibus Masoræ varie illustravit, notis criticis confirmavit S. Baer. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1891. Pp. vi., 130, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Boardman, George Dana. The Problem of Jesus. Philadelphia: Huber, 1891. Pp. 35, 12mo, 25 cts.

Boedder, B. Natural Theology. London: 1891. Pp. 490, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Bolin, W. Ludwig Feuerbach, sein Wirken und seine Zeitgenossen. Mit Benutzung ungedruckten Materials dargestellt. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1891. Pp. x., 353, 8vo, 6 mk.

Bosse, F. Der präexistente Christus des Justinus Martyr, eine Episode aus der Geschichte des christologischen Dogmas. Dissertation. Greifswald, 1891. Pp. iv., 56, 8vo.

Brockett, L. P., M.D. The Story of the Karen Mission in Bassein, 1830-1890; or, The Progress and Education of a People from a Degraded Heathenism to a Refined Christian Civilization. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891, Pp. xx., 160, 12mo, cloth, 90 c.

Bruesselbach, J. Das helle Licht der Wahrheit oder die wissenschaftliche Weltanschauung, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionsvorstellungen dargestellt. Leipzig: Richter, 1891. Pp. xii., 77, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Buchwald, R. De liturgia gallicana. Dissertation. Vratislaviæ, 1890. Pp. 44, 8vo.

Burckhardt, J. The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy. Cheap edition. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 570, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Campe, W. Das Verhältniss Jeremias zu den Psalmen. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Alter der Psalmen. Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle u. S.: 1891. Pp. 38, 8vo.

Chandler, A. The Spirit of Man. An essay in Christian Philosophy. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 228, p. 8vo, 5s.

Christinnecke, Johs. Causalität und Entwickelung in der Metaphysik Augustins. 1. Theil. Jena (Leipzig: Fock), 1891. Pp. 60, 8vo, 1 mk.

Culross, James, D.D. Carey, the Pioneer Missionary. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 214, 16mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Cunningham, W., D.D. The Use and Abuse of Money. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. xxiv., 219, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Cutler, H. G. The World's Fair; its Meaning and Scope, its Old World Friends, their Countries, Customs and Religions; what they will Exhibit. Chicago: Star Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. 640, 8vo, cloth, $5.00.

Davis, J. A., Rev. Upton. Its Church, pastor, people, and saloons, and what they did. New York: Ref. Ch. Bd. Pub., 1891. Pp. vi., 426, 12mo, $1.25.

Dieckhoff, Aug. Wilhelm, Prof., D.D. Die Inspiration und Irrthumslosigkeit der heiligen Schrift. Leipzig: Naumann, 1891. Pp. iii., 110, 8vo, 2 mk.

Dods, Marcus, D.D. The Gospel of St. John. Vol. I. (Expositor's Bible.) New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. xi., 388, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Driver, S. R., D.D. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. xxix., 522, 8vo, cloth, $2.50 net. (The International Theological Library, edited by Charles A. Briggs, D.D., and Stewart D. F. Salmond, D.D. No. 1.)

Earle, Alice Morse. The Sabbath in Puritan New England. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. viii., 335, 12mo, $1.25.

Eaton, Arthur Wentworth, B. A. The Church of England in Nova Scotia, and the Tory Clergy of the Revolution. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. xiv., 320, 12mo, $1.50.

Edwards, Tryon, D.D. A Dictionary of Thoughts. Being a cyclopedia of laconic quotations from the best authors, both ancient and modern. Alphabetically arranged by subjects. New York: Cassell, 1891. Pp. xii., 644, 8vo, $5.00.

Epstein, Abraham. Rabbi Simeon Karo und der Ialkut Simeoni. Ein Essay. Krakau (Wien: Lippe), 1891. Pp. 22, 8vo, 75 pf.

Expositor's Bible. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D. The Acts of the Apostles, by G. T. Stokes, D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. xxiii., 424, 8vo, $1.50.

Eye, A. von. Die neue Weltanschauung. 1. Heft. Verwirklichung der frohen Botschaft. Leipzig: Spohr, 1891. Pp. 32, 8vo, 60 pf.

Feiler, Willy. Die Moral des Albertus Magnus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Ethik des Mittelalters. Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig: 1891. Pp. 84, 8vo.

Fradenburgh, J. N., D.D. Departed Gods; the Gods of our Fathers Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. ii., 464, 12mo, cloth, $1.20.

From the Heart of England. A story of the dawn of modern missions; by the author of "Old Bristol." Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 416, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Grau, R. Fr., Prof. Luther's Katechismus, erklärt aus biblischer Theologie. Eine kurze Glaubenslehre. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. viii., 112, 8vo, 1.40 mk.

Grössel, W. Justinianus von Weltz, der Vorkämpfer der lutherischen Mission. (Faber's Missionsbibliothek, Nr. 2 und 3.) Leipzig: Faber, 1891. Pp. iv., 191, 8vo, 2 mk.

Grundemann, R., Dr. Hannkb Dato, der braune Pastor. Eine Lebensgeschichte aus der Kolsmission. (Dornen und Aehren vom Missionsfelde. Heft 4) Berlin: Müller, 1891. 10 pf.

Grundl, Beda. De Interpolationibus ex Sancti Justini philosophi et martyris Apologia secunda expungendis. Dissertatio inauguralis. Augustæ Vindelicorum, 1891. Pp. 76, 8vo.

Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften, bearbeitet von Achelis, Cornill Ficker und Anderen. 2. Theil. 1. Band. Einleitung in das Alte Testament, von Prof. Dr. Carl Heinrich Cornill. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. xii., 325, 8vo, 5 mk.

Hand-Commentar zum neuen Testament, bearbeitet von H. J. Holtzmann, R. A. Lipsius, P. W. Schmiedel, H. von Soden. 3. Band. 1. Abtheilung. Die Briefe an die Kolosser, Epheser, Philemon. Die Pastoralbriefe. Bearbeitet von H. von Soden. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. iii., vii., 255, 8vo. $4.50.

Haupt, O. Luther und Rabelais in ihren pädagogischen Beziehungen. Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig, 1890. Pp. 48.

Hedge, Frederic Henry. Sermons. Boston: Roberts, 1891. Pp. v., 341, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Heilman, Lee M., Rev. Christian Nurture in the Lutheran Church and Home. The scriptural law of education from infancy to complete life. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 224, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Hillel, F., Dr. Die Nominalbildungen in der Mischnah. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1891. Pp. 52, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Hofmeyer, N. J. The Blessed Life: How to Find it and Live it. Author's edition. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 251, 12mo, $1.00.

Hughey, G. W., D.D. Baptismal Remission; or, The Design of Christian Baptism. Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. ii., 134, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Hulst, M. d'. Christianisme et Occultisme. Paris: Soye, 1891. Pp. 27, 8vo.

Hunt, A. N., Rev. Sermons for the Christian Year. Vol. I. Advent to Whit-Sunday. Vol. II. Trinity to Advent. London: Skeffington, 1891. P. 8vo, each, 5s.

Iken, J. Friedrich. Die bremische Kirchenordnung von 1534. Herausgegeben von der historischen Gesellschaft des Künstlervereins. Bremen: Müller, 1891. Pp. lxxxiii., 116, 8vo, 3 mk.

Inheritance of the Saints; or, Thoughts on the Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to Come. Collected chiefly from English writers by L. P., with a preface by H. S. Holland. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 372, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

International Congregational Council, London, 1891. Authorized Record of Proceedings. With introduction by R. W. Dale. London: Clarke, 1891. Pp. 450, roy. 8vo, 5s.

Jacob, B. Das Buch Esther bei den LXX. Inaugural-Dissertation. Giessen, 1891. Pp. 64, 8vo.

Jacquier, E. La doctrine des douze Apôtres et ses enseignements. Thèse. Paris: Lethielleux, 1891. Pp. 279, 8vo.

Jenkins, R. C. Pre-Tridentine Doctrine. A review of the commentary on the Scriptures of Thomas de Vio, commonly called the Cardinal Cajetan. London: Nutt, 1891. 8vo, 5s.

Johnson, E. H., D.D. Outline of Systematic Theology. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 304, 8vo, cloth, $2.00.

Jones, W. H. On the Way Home. Sixty short sermons for life's travellers. London: Skeffington, 1891. Pp. 210, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Juncker, A. Das Ich und die Motivation des Willens im Christenthum. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung des endämonistischen Problems. Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle a. S.: 1891. Pp. ii., 78.

Kneer, A. Kardinal Zabarella (Franciscus de Zabarellis, Cardinalis Florentinus), 1360–1417. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schismas. Theil I. Dissertation. Münster, 1891. Pp. viii., 68. 8vo.

Kohut, Alexander, Rabbi. Dr. Aruch Completum, sive Lexicon Vocabula et res, quæ in libris Targumicis, Talmudicis, et Midraschicis continentur, explicans Nathane filio Jechielis, etc. Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. 401-468 und 316, 8vo, 15 mk. (In hebräischer Sprache.)

La Broise, R. de. Bossuet et la Bible, étude d'après les documents originaux. Paris: Retaux-Bray, 1891. Pp. lii., 453, 8vo.

Lasteyrie, R. de. L'Eglise Saint-Martin de Tours.

Étude Critique sur l'histoire et la forme de ce monument du ve au xie siecle. Paris: Klincksieck, 1891. Pp. 56, 4to.

Löhr, Max, Dr. Die Klagelieder des Jeremias erklärt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891. Pp. 101, Lex. 8vo, 3 mk.

Loowy, Theodor, Dr. Der Idealismus Berkeley's in den Grundlagen untersucht. Wien: Tempsky, 1891. Pp. 142, 8vo, 2.80 mk.

Lotz, Wilhelm, Prof., Dr. Geschichte und Offenbarung im Alten Testament. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. ix., 353, 8vo, 6.80 mk.

McCann, J. The Moral Culture of the Christian. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 128, 12mo, 1s.

McConnell, S. D., Rev., D.D. Sons of God. Sermons. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. v., 291, 8vo, $1.50.

MacDuff, J. R., D.D. Hospices of the Pilgrim. The great rest word of Christ. New York: Nelson, 1891. Pp. 192, 16mo, cloth, $1.00.

MacLaren, A. The God of the Amen, and other Sermons. London: Alexander, 1891. Pp. 348, p. 8vo, 5s.

McNeill, John, Rev. Sermons. Vol. III. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 408, 8vo, $1.50.

March, Daniel M., D.D. Morning Light in many Lands, Boston: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. ii., 416, 8vo. cloth, $2.00. (Gives results of a tour of mission fields.)

Martineau, James. Essays, Reviews, and Addresses. Selected and revised by the author. Vol. III. Theological and Philosophical. Vol. IV. Academical, Religious. London: Longman, 1891. Pp. 562, 596, p. 8vo, each, 7s. 6d.

Meyer, F. B., Rev. Abraham; or, The Obedience of Faith. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 205, 12mo, cloth, $1.00. (Also) Elijah, and the Secret of his Power. The same. Pp. 224, 12mo, cloth, $1.00. (Also) Israel, a Prince with God The same. Pp. 180, 12mo, cloth, $1.00. (Also) Joseph; Beloved, Hated, Exalted. The same. Pp. 190, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Mitchell, J. Murray, M.A., LL.D. (ed.). Once Hindu, now Christian. The early life of Baba Padmanje. An autobiography. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. x., 155, 12mo, 75 cts.

Molsdorf, Wilhelm. Die Idee des Schönen in der Weltgestaltung bei Thomas von Aquino. Dissertation. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. 47, 8vo, 80 pf.

Moore, Aubrey, L., M.A. The Message of the Gospel. Addresses to candidates for ordination, and sermons preached chiefly before the University of Oxford. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. viii., 153, 8vo, 75 cts.

Mosen, P. Hieronymus Emser, der Vorkämpfer Roms gegen die Reformation. Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle a. S.: 1890. Pp. 78, 8vo.

Murray, J. Clark, LL D. An Introduction to Ethics. Boston: De Wolf, 1891. Pp. vi., 437, 18mo.

National Temperance Convention. Proceedings of the Tenth National Temperance Convention held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., July 15 and 16, 1891; containing the papers presented, speeches delivered, resolutions and reports adopted, roll of delegates, etc. New York: Nat. Temp. Soc., 1891. Pp. ii., 215, 8vo, paper, 25 cts.

Naville, Th. Les sacrifices lévitiques et l'expiation. Courte esquisse. Lausanne: Bridel, 1891. Pp. 150, 8vo, 2 fr.

Netter, N. Die Geschichte Noah's und die Sündflut. Eine Uebersetzung und kritische Behandlung des Midrasch Rabbah; nebst Anhang. Inaugural-Dissertation. Strassburg, 1891. Pp. ii., 132, 8vo.

Nevin, John Williamson, D.D., LL.D. College Chapel Sermons. Edited by Henry M. Keiffer, D.D., and compiled from the Editor's Notes taken at the time of their delivery. With an introduction by W. M. Reilly, Ph.D. Philadelphia: Ref. Ch. Pub. Ho., 1891. Pp. 231, 12mo, $1.25.

Page, Jesse. David Brainerd, the Apostle to the North American Indians. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 160, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts. (Missionary Biographies, No. 3.)

Paludan-Müller, J. Guds Rige og evangeliske Tro. Kjobenhavn, 1891. Pp. 208, 8vo, 3.75 mk.

Pitra, J. B. Analecta Sacra. Spicilegium Solesmense. Vol. VII. Paris, 1891. 8vo, 15 fr.

Ratte, Franz. Der Redemptorist Karl Clemens (1816-1886). Ein noch unbekanntes Convertitenbild. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1891. Pp. vii., 123, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Renan, Ernest. History of the People of Israel from the Time of Hezekiah till the Return from Babylon. Boston: Roberts, 1891. Pp. x., 429, 12mo, cloth, $2.50.

Ricardon, A. De humanæ mentis æternitate apud Spinozam. Paris: Alcan, 1891. Pp. 92, 8vo.

Robertson, J. M. Modern Humanists. Sociological Studies of Carlyle, Mill, Emerson, Arnold, Ruskin, and Spencer. London, 1891. Pp. 270, 8vo, 3s.

Roberty, E. de. La Philosophie du siècle. Criticisme, Positivisme, Evolutionisme. Paris, 1891. Pp. viii., 235, 8vo, 5 fr.

Roland's nachmals Papstes Alexander III., Sentenzen. Zum ersten Male herausgegeben von Ambrosius M. Gietl, O. Pr. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. lxx., 332, 8vo, 9 mk.

Rose, Stewart. St. Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits. New York: Cath. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. xv., 432, 8vo, $6.00.

Rossi, St. John Baptist de, Life of ——; from the Italian by Lady Herbert; introduction on ecclesiastical training and the sacerdotalism by the Bishop of Salford. Baltimore: Murphy, 1891. Pp. iv., 311, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Rydberg, Viktor. Teutonic Mythology. Authorized translation from the Swedish, by Rasmus B. Anderson. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 702, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

St. Clair, George. Buried Cities and Bible Countries. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. x., 378, 8vo, $2.00.

St. Jure, J. B. Christ our Teacher. From the French: with introduction by James, Cardinal Gibbons. Baltimore: McCauley, 1891. Pp. 424, 24mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Saussaye, P. D. C. de la. Manual of the Science of Religion. Translated from the German by Beatrice S. Colyer-Fergusson. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 670, 12s. 6d.

Sayce, A. H., Rev. The Races of the Old Testament. London: Rel. Tr. Soc, 1891. P. 8vo, 3s.

Schaeder, E Die Bedeutung des lebendigen Christus für die Rechtfertigung nach Paulus. Dissertation. Gütersloh, 1891. Pp. 90, 8vo.

Schmid, Franc., Prof., Dr. Quæstiones selectæ ex theologia dogmatica. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1891. Pp. vi., 493, 8vo, 8 mk.

Schmidt, Wilhelm, Dr. Der alte Glaube und die Wahrheit des Christenthums. Berlin: Wiegandt, 1891. Pp. iii., 374, 8vo, 6 mk.

Schneider (Küstrin), O. Transcendental psychologie. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. iv., 467, 8vo, 10 mk.

Schürer, Emil, D.D., M.A. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Being a revised edition of a "Manual of History of New Testament Times." First Division. Political History of Palestine from B.C. 175 to A.D. 135. Translated by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A. 2 vols. Second Division. The Internal Condition of Palestine and of the Jewish People, in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by Sophia Taylor and the Rev. Peter Christie. 3 vols. Index, translated by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A. (Edinburgh: Clark); New York: Scribners, 1885-91. Pp. viii., 467; viii., 407; xii., 379; viii., 327; viii., 387; xiv., 339, 8vo, $8 00.

Schultze, Th., Dr. Das Christenthum Christi und die Religion der Liebe. Ein Votum in Sachen der Zukunftsreligion. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Secretan, G. Les Premières Missions évangéliques en pays païens. Paris, 1891. Pp. 71. 8vo.

Siegfried, Carl, und Stade, Bernard, Proff., Drs. Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testamente. Mit 2 Anhängen, I. Lexidion zu den aramäischen Stücken des Alten Testamentes. II. Deutsch-hebräisches Wörterverzeichniss. 1. Abtheilung. Leipzig: Veit, 1892 (1891). Pp. 480, 8vo, 15 mk.

Silberstein, M., Dr. Einleitende Ideen zur Geschichte der Juden und des Judenthums. Vortrag. Wiesbaden: Limbarth, 1891. Pp. 14, 8vo, 60 pf.

Simcox, W. H. The Cessation of Prophecy, and other Sermons. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 330, p. 8vo, 6s.

Staerk, W. Untersuchungen über die Komposition und Abfassungszeit von Zach. 9 bis 14 mit eingehender Berücksichtigung der neuesten Hypothese. Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle a. S.: 1891. Pp. 102, 8vo.

Steenstra, P. H., Rev., D.D. The Being of God as Unity and Trinity. New York: Houghton, 1891. Pp. vi., 269, 12mo, $1.50.

Stokes, G. T., D.D. The Acts of the Apostles. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. xx., 424, 8vo, $1.50. (Expositor's Bible.)

Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica. Essays chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism. (See Mag. for Aug., 1891.) New York: Macmillan, 1891. $4 00.

Tarniquet, G., Abbé. Le Premier Français martyrisé au Japon, ou Vie de vénérable Guillaume Courtet, religieux dominicain. Lille: Desclée, 1891. Pp. 215, 8vo.

Thouvenot, E. Vie de Jean Chrysostome. Toulouse: Lagarde, 1891. Pp. 219, 12mo, 1.40 fr.

Tomkins, H. G. The Life and Times of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore. London: Rel. Tr. Soc., 1891. P. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Tuttle, James H., D.D. The Field and the Fruit. A memorial of twenty-five years' ministry with the Church of the Redeemer, Minneapolis. Boston: Univ. Pub. Ho., 1891. Pp. ii., 362, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Upham, Francis W., LL.D. Saint Matthew's Witness to Words and Works of our Lord: or, Our Saviour's Life as Revealed in the Gospel of his Earliest Evangelist. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. vi., 415, 12mo, $1.20.

Weinstein, N. I. Geschichtliche Entwickelung des Gebotes der Nächstenliebe innerhalb des Judenthums. Kritisch beleuchtet. Berlin: Rosenstein, 1891. Pp. 48, 8vo, 1.25 mk.

Willems, C. La saint robe de N. S. Jésus Christ à Trèves. Etude archéologique et historique. Traduite par F. Raynaud. Trier: Paulinusdruckerei, 1891. Pp. 339, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Worms, René, LL.D. Eléments de philosophie scientifique et de philosophie morale, rédigés conformément aux programmes de mathématiques élémentaires. Paris: Hachette, 1891. Pp. vi., 115, 12mo, 1.50 fr.

Wyclif, Johannis, Tractatus de blasphemia. Now first edited from the Vienna MS. 4514, with critical and historical notes by M. H. Dziewicki. Lond.: Trübner (for Wyclif Soc.), 1891. Pp. xl., 295, 8vo. (Also) De Eucharistia tractatus major. Accedit tractatus de eucharistia et pœnitentia sive de Confessione. Now first edited from the manuscripts with critical and historical notes by Johann Loserth. (English side-notes by F. D. Matthew.) The same. 1892 (1891). Pp. lxii., 359, 8vo.

Zisterer, A., Dr. Gregor X. und Rudolf von Habsburg in ihren beiderseitigen Beziehungen. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Frage über die grundsätzliche Stellung von Sacerdotium und Imperium in jener Zeit, nebst einigen Beiträgen zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Reiches. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. vii., 170, 8vo, 3 mk.

CHRONICLE.

(*Closes on the 20th of each month.*)

Sept. 15. German-Presbyterian convention at Nyack, N. Y.

Sept. 16. The one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Reformed Dutch Church at Fishkill, N. Y., celebrated.

Sept. 21-24. National conference of Unitarian and other Christian churches, Saratoga, N. Y.

Sept. 22–24. German Catholic convention at Buffalo, N. Y.

Sept. 22. Rev. Howard MacQueary renounced the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Sept. 25 his deposition was pronounced at Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland, O. He has accepted a call to the First Universalist Church of Saginaw, Mich.

Sept. 27. Rev. A. P. Bissell, Ph.D., D.D., accepts the professorship of Hebrew, Biddle University, Charlotte, N. C.

Oct. 5. The charges and specifications of the indictment for heresy against the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, presented in the Presbytery of New York at the regular fall meeting. The citation was placed in Dr. Briggs' hands Oct. 6, and the answer to it was set down for Wednesday, Nov. 4.

Oct. 6–8. Semi-annual convention of the fifth conference of the Ex-Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States at Augustaville, Pa.

Oct. 7–21. Œcumenical Methodist conference, Washington, D. C. (see programme in last number).

Oct. 10. The one hundred and fourth anniversary of the Moravian Society for Propagating the Gospel, at Bethlehem, Pa.

Oct. 13–16. Eighty-second annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at Pittsfield, Mass Opening sermon by Rev. Dr. E. B. Webb, of Boston, Mass.

Oct. 14. Consecration of Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., as Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts, in Trinity Church, Boston, Mass. Sermon by Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York.

Oct. 15. Twenty-third convention of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America, Buffalo, N. Y.

Oct. 20–22. Forty-fifth annual meeting of the American Missionary Association at Cleveland, O. Opening sermon by Rev. Albert J. Lyman, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

OBITUARY.

Caldwell, Rt. Rev. Robert, D.D., LL.D. (Church of England), assistant bishop to the Bishop of Madras, from 1877 till shortly before his death, at Madras, July 28, 1891, aged 77. He went out to Madras in 1838. He was the author of a "Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages," a "History of the Tinnevelly Mission," and other works.

Burchard, Rev. Samuel Dickinson, D.D. (Presbyterian), died at Saratoga, N. Y., Sept. 25, 1891, aged 80. He was a pastor in New York from 1839 to 1885.

Hodge, Rev. Caspar Wistar, D.D., LL.D. (Presbyterian), Professor of New Testament exegesis in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., since 1860; died there, Sept. 27, 1891, aged 61.

Boone, Rt. Rev. William Jones, D.D. (Episcopalian Bishop of Shanghai), died at Shanghai, China, Oct. 5, 1891, aged 45. He was born at Shanghai, returned there as missionary in 1869, and was consecrated a bishop in 1884.

CALENDAR.

Oct. 21. Meeting of the Universalist General Convention at Worcester, Mass.

Oct. 24. Enthronement of the Bishop-elect of Lichfield (the Hon. and Rev. Augustus Legge), at Lichfield, Eng.

Oct. 24. Thirteenth quadrennial General Conference of Wesleyan Methodists at Grand Rapids, Mich.

Oct. 28. Consecration of Rev. J. L. Nicholson, D.D., as Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Milwaukee, at St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Oct. 28–29. Annual meeting of the Unitarian Sunday-School Society, at Fitchburg, Mass.

Nov. 11. Meeting of the General Missionary Committee of the M. E. Church, at Cleveland, O.

Nov. 17. Fourteenth meeting of the Protestant Episcopal Church Congress, at Washington, D. C.

Nov. 17–19. Meeting of the Baptist Missionary Union, at Buffalo, N. Y.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5. DECEMBER, 1891. No. 3.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE GREEK CHURCH AND PROTESTANT MISSIONS; OR, MISSIONS TO THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

BY REV. HENRY H. JESSUP, D.D., BEIRUT, SYRIA.

THE Oriental churches may be divided into six great classes, comprising fourteen different sects:

I. The Monophysite, Eutychian, or anti-Chalcedonian sects, who reject the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon held in 451. These are four: the Armenians, Jacobites (or Syrians), Copts, and Abyssinians. They all have their own distinct ritual and calendar, are hostile to each other and to all other Christian sects, have a married parish clergy, and reject the primacy of the Pope.

II. The anti-Ephesian, who reject the Council of Ephesus in 431. These are the Nestorians or Chaldeans. They have a married clergy, a high reverence for the Scriptures, and but little picture worship.

III. The Orthodox Greek, who accept the seven General Councils. The Greek Church is Rome decapitated—a priestly system without a pontifex, an exclusive traditional Church, which yet allows the Bible to the people. In the Turkish Empire its patriarchs and the most of its bishops are foreigners, speaking only Greek and ignorant of the customs and wants of the people, though of late the Syrians of the Greek Church demand bishops of the Arab race. The parish clergy are married and generally most illiterate. The present Anglican bishop of Jerusalem remarked to a traveller recently that "no one but those who lived in the East could be aware of the gross ignorance and immorality of the Greek priests." Ordinarily the practice in appointing priests is that of Jeroboam, who "made priests of the lowest of the people."

IV. The Maronite, a papal sect, the ancient Monothelites, who accepted the papacy in 1182 A.D. They are chiefly peasants in Northern Lebanon, an ignorant people, and an educated priesthood sworn to allegiance to Rome, and yet like all the above in having a married parish clergy. The Maronite patriarch is regarded by his people as hardly inferior to the Pope.

V. The six Oriental papal sects, who are converts from six of the above sects to the Church of Rome. They are the Papal Greek, Papal Armenian, Papal Syrian, Papal Nestorian, Papal Coptic, and Papal Abyssinian. They maintain their own calendars and saint days, the marriage of the clergy, and various ancient prerogatives which the papal legates are now striving most assiduously to abolish.

VI. The Latins, a small community composed chiefly of attachés of the French and Italian monasteries, who have conformed in all respects to the Church of Rome.

These sects all agree sufficiently both in the common truth and the common error which they hold, to be classed as one—one in their need of reformation, one in being an obstacle to the Christianization of the Mohammedan world.

They all hold the doctrine of transubstantiation, of baptismal regeneration, priestly absolution, Mariolatry and saint worship, image and picture worship, auricular confession, and prayers for the dead. Their patriarchs and bishops are celibate, but the parish clergy are generally allowed to marry once. Instruction in the Scriptures is virtually unknown.

The numbers of these sects, not including Russia and Greece, are as follows: Greece, 1,000,000; Maronites, 230,000; Nestorian Catholics, 20,000; Greek Catholics, 50,000; Jacobite Syrians, 30,000; other papal sects, 300,000; Nestorians, 140,000; Nestorians in India, 116,000; Armenians, 3,000,000; Copts, 200,000; Abyssinians, 4,500,000; total, 9,586,000.

Thus we have about ten millions of nominal Christians scattered throughout the great centres and seats of Mohammedan population and power.

These Christian sects have never felt the impulse of such an awakening as shook all Europe in the days of the Reformation. About thirty years after the death of Luther the German Protestant divines opened correspondence with the Patriarch of Constantinople, but he rejected their overtures with contempt. The Greek Church "knew not the day of its visitation." For three hundred years after that time, with the exception of the sending of papal legates, hardly a movement was made in Europe toward modifying the state of the Eastern churches.

In the year 1819 the first American missionaries came to Western Asia, bringing the Gospel of Christ to the Mohammedans, but in their explorations they came in contact with these various Oriental Christian sects. They found them to be ignorant, illiterate, superstitious, idolatrous, despised, and hated by the Mohammedans.

Yet they were instructed "not to interfere with the Oriental churches, but to visit the ecclesiastics and persuade them, if possible, to abandon their errors, which are repugnant to the Word of God."

They gave themselves, therefore, to the work of education, Bible distribution, and the press. But in 1832 the Greek bishops in Latakiah, Tripoli, Damascus, and other places gathered the Arabic Bibles (printed in London from the version of the Roman propaganda) and burned them in the courtyards of the churches. In 1830 the Maronite patriarch put to death Asaad-esh-Shidiak, the martyr of Lebanon, for reading the Bible and rejecting the errors of Rome.

In September, 1835, Rev. Drs. Eli Smith and W. M. Thomson and other missionaries, in reply to the request of a papal Greek priest from Acre to profess the Protestant faith, adopted the following minutes: 1. It is not an object with us to draw individuals from other native Christian sects and thereby increase our own denomination. 2. Yet according to the principles of the churches who have sent us hither, when a member of any native sect, giving satisfactory evidence of piety, desires the sacraments of us, we cannot refuse his request, however it may interfere with his previous ecclesiastical relations." On this basis individuals of the various Oriental churches, including bishops, priests, and others were received to the Lord's table together with baptized converts from the Druzes.

But the number of enlightened men and women increased in various parts of the land, and they demanded the right to be organized into a distinct Protestant Church of their own.

This request was finally acceded to, and the first Protestant native Syrian church was organized in 1848. Since that time twenty-five other churches have been organized in this mission, with about 1700 communicants from among Moslems, Jews, Druzes, Greeks, Maronites, Nusairiyeh, and Bedawin Arabs.

The whole number of Protestant churches in the empire is now about 175, with 20,000 communicants and nearly 100,000 adherents. The majority of these communities are undoubtedly from the Oriental churches, and we are now met by the high ecclesiastical party in the Anglican Church with the protest that this whole movement is a mistake. It is denounced as proselytism, as an attempt to build up one Christian Church at the expense of another. It is said that these Greeks and Maronites and others have the creeds of Christendom, and we have no right to receive their followers into our churches. We do not propose to reply to this charge by the "*et tu Brute*" countercharge that these same high sacerdotalists do not hesitate in England and America to receive scores of Methodists and Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Friends to their own church, without feeling that they have committed the heinous sin of proselytism. The work of missions in the East can be justified without such a personal *argumentum ad hominem*.

Let us consider the whole question calmly, in the light of God's Word and Providence.

The chief and ultimate object of missionary work in Western Asia is the conversion of the Mohammedans to the Christian faith. They number 180,000,000 in Asia and Africa, and constitute one of the great influential factors in the future religious history of the race. The Gospel is to be given to them. All the Christian churches which have any missionary zeal admit this. Thus far they are almost unaffected by the great missionary movements of the nineteenth century.

They believe in one God and in the divine origin of the Old and New Testaments; but regard the Scriptures as corrupted, deny the divinity of Christ, ignore the spirituality of religion, and look upon Christians as their hereditary enemies. Having seen only the Oriental type of Christianity, they despise its immorality and idolatry, and protest against the creature worship and image worship of both the Greek and Latin churches. Images, pictures, and saint are the abomination of the Mohammedan world.

The pagans of the second century objected to Christianity that it had neither altars nor images; the Moslem of the nineteenth century objects to Christianity that it has only images and altars.

The Christian missionary to-day urges a Mohammedan to accept Christianity. He is met with the derisive reply, "Thank God we are not idol worshippers as are you Christians, and God willing, we never will be. We have lived among Christians twelve hundred years, and we want none of your creature worship. There is no God but God." The missionary may protest and explain, but until he can show the Moslem a pure Christianity in life and doctrine, and illustrate by living examples the Bible ideal of a Christian church, his appeals and arguments will be in vain.

This state of things confronted all Christian missionaries in Oriental lands fifty years ago, and it confronts them to-day.

These Oriental churches are among the greatest obstacles to the conversion of their Mohammedan neighbors. Protestants generally will admit this with regard to the Church of Rome, and at the same time there are those who contend that the Greek Church is purer, and hence should be intrusted with the work of evangelizing the Moslems and Jews in Western Asia. As this question is now a "burning" one in the Anglican Church, let us ask what is the teaching and practice of the Greek Church in Western Asia to-day? Our reply will be taken chiefly from their own ecclesiastical books. The XIXth Article of faith of the Church of England declares that "as the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." And in Article XXII., "The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints is repugnant to the Word of God."

I. In the Greek Catechism, Jerusalem ed., page 82, we read, "It is one of the presumptuous sins against the Holy Spirit, to hope for salvation without works to merit it." It is plainly taught that justification can only be obtained as a reward of meritorious actions. In this the Greeks and Latins agree, only that in the Latin theology "the merit of good works is acquired only through the atonement of Christ, while the Greek Church puts into a motley confusion Christ, the sacraments, the priest, and good works." * Rejecting the scriptural doctrine of justification by faith, the door is thrown open for endless error and confusion.

II. A sacrament is defined to be "a sacred performance whereby grace acts in a mysterious manner upon man. In other words, it is the power of God unto salvation." † "The sacraments are divided into two classes: first, such as are absolutely necessary in themselves—namely, baptism, holy chrism, and communion. These are indispensably necessary for procuring salvation and eternal life; for it is impossible to be saved without them. The second division embraces those sacraments, the necessity for which proceeds from something else."

III. "The benefits conferred by baptism are the remission of original sin, the remission of all past actual sins, and grace to sustain the believer in his conflict with the world, the flesh, and the devil."

In baptism the first step is exorcising the evil spirit by an elaborate prayer of conjuration. Then the priest breathes into the mouth of the candidate, on his forehead, and on his bosom, each time saying, "Dispel from him every evil and polluted spirit which may lurk in his heart," etc.

Then the candidate or his godfather renounces the devil, his works, his angels, his service, and his pomp.

The water and oil are then consecrated. In the prayer of consecration for the water is the petition, "Make it a fountain of immortality, granting sanctification, forgiving sins, dispelling diseases, destroying devils," etc. Similar language is used in consecrating the oil.

The person is then immersed three times, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This trine immersion is regarded as essential, and all converts to the Greek Church must be rebaptized. In this respect the Greek Church is far more exclusive than the Church of Rome. It does not admit that the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury has ever been baptized. Rome admits lay baptism, and baptism by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. The Greek Church insists on trine immersion by a Greek priest. An Anglican clergyman once asked permission to "assist" a Greek priest in his service in Nazareth. The priest politely informed him that as he had

---

* "Religion in the East," by Rev. John Wortabet, M.D., London, 1860, an admirable book which should be reprinted and widely read.

† Universal Catechism, Part I., sec. 10.

never been either baptized or ordained his request must be declined.

IV. After baptism the priest administers holy chrism. The oil for this purpose is a mixture of olive oil and aromatic substances made in a decoction by the bishop. The fuel used is the half-rotten and worn-out wood of the holy pictures (eikons), which have been worn off by the constant kissing of devout worshippers or so worm-eaten by age as to be useless.

The priest anoints the candidate's forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, ears, breast, hands, and feet in the form of a cross, saying, "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen." The communion is then administered equally to adults and infants. *Eucologion*, Jerusalem, 1856, (under inspection of Cyril, Patriarch of Jerusalem.)

V. As all sin, original and actual, committed before baptism is washed away by it, subsequent sins are pardoned by the sacrament of "repentance," "whereby he who confesses his sins is pardoned by Jesus Christ himself, through the absolution pronounced by the priest." After confession the priest says, "As to the sins which thou hast confessed, go in peace without the least anxiety."

VI. Penances, such as fasting over and above the appointed times, are imposed on the penitent, to "cleanse the conscience and give peace of mind." *

VII. The Communion is a sacrificial mass, both a eucharistical and propitiatory sacrifice. In the liturgy of the mass hardly a vestige of the original institution of the Lord's Supper has been preserved. The priest takes a cake of bread in his left hand and the sacred spear in his right, touches the bread with the spear four times in the form of a cross, repeating words from Scripture. Deacon: "Lift up, O Lord." The priest takes up the sacred bread, saying, "He was cut off out of the land of the living." He then inverts the bread in the silver plate. Deacon: "Slay, O Lord." The priest then slays the bread in the form of a cross, etc. Deacon: "Pierce, O Lord." The priest then pierces the right side of the cake.

The priest then takes another cake, and cutting off a part, takes it up on the point of the spear, saying, "In honor and commemoration of our most blessd lady Mary, the mother of God, whose virginity is perpetual. by whose intercessions accept, O God, this sacrifice upon thy heavenly altar." He then puts it on the right side of the sacred bread, saying, "Upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir." He then cuts nine pieces from the cake, in commemoration of prophets, apostles, fathers, bishops, martyrs, saints, the bishop of the diocese, all the priests and deacons, "For those who built the temple, even for the forgiveness of their sins, . . . for those who die in hope of the resurrection, for those who present the bread;" and for all the quick and the dead whom the priest chooses to mention. Then, after various other prayers and ceremonies, the priest says, "Let both the bread and the mingled wine and water be transmuted and transformed by thy Holy Spirit."

The deacon then takes a fan and fans the holy substances and the priest says, "We present unto thee this reasonable sacrifice for the believers who are dead, for the primitive parents, for the fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, martyrs, confessors, hermits, and teachers, and for the soul of every just man who died in the faith."

At this juncture persons may be seen entering the inner temple where the priest is "sacrificing," and laying down pieces of money, at the same time repeating to him the names they wish to have mentioned and to receive a part of the benefit from the sacrifice. For a dead person masses are always performed specially.

An ex-Greek priest, now for twenty years a Protestant native preacher in Syria, has informed me that he could never hear the ringing sound of the money brought to him while reading the communion service, as a Greek priest, without a shudder, and this was one of the offensive rites of the Greek Church which drove him into Protestantism.

VIII. The Greek Church believes in the existence of a limbus wherein the souls of departed men are received and kept until the Day of Judgment. The Catechism teaches that "prayers offered in behalf of such as die in the faith without having yielded fruits meet for repentance are efficacious in helping them to obtain a blessed resurrection; especially if such prayers are accompanied by the offering of the bloodless sacrifice, the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, and by alms offered in faith in behalf of them."

IX. We now come to one of the most repulsive and unchristian features of the Greek Church, the worship of images. The Council of Constantinople (A.D. 754), composed of 338 bishops, enacted laws repressing the growing idolatry of the Eastern Church, but their triumph was brief. The infamous Irene, having first poisoned her husband in order to obtain the regency of the kingdom during the minority of her son, and then having deposed Paul, one of the iconoclasti, from the patriarchal chair of Constantinople and put Tarasius, her secretary, in his place, assembled in concert with Hadrian, the Roman pontiff, a council (A.D. 786), and through it established the worship of images. In spite of the opposition of Charlemagne and the decrees of the Council of Frankfort (A.D. 894), composed of 300 bishops, forbidding image worship, the Roman pontiff maintained it, and the Greek Church to this day defends it on account of the Seventh General Council at Nice in 786. The only difference between the Greek and Latin image worship is that the Greeks repudiate carved images and statues, and use pictures painted on wood and canvas, the Greek word eikon meaning both pictures and images.

---

* Universal Catechism, Part I., sec. 10.

In the Synnaxar for the first Sunday in Lent is the gracious expression, "As to the impious infidels who are not willing to honor the holy images, we excommunicate and curse them, saying Anathema." And in the Horologion, Beirut ed., 1849, page 696, the crime of idolatry seems to reach its climax. In the prayers to the Virgin offered during Holy Week the curses of the Church are poured upon the heads of all those who do not worship images. "May the lips of the impious (hypocrites—*el-mu-nafikeen*) become dumb, who worship not thy revered likeness, O Mary, which was painted by Luke, the most holy evangelist, and by which we have been led to the faith."

It is a painful and sickening spectacle to enter a Greek church and see the crowds of worshippers burning incense, lighting tapers, and bowing before the filthy, painted boards and then devoutly kissing them and crossing themselves. Bishops, priests, deacons, and people vie with each other in honoring these creatures of the infamous Irene. In Bishop Blyth's Second Annual Report, July, 1890, page 23, he speaks of "the iconostasis in the Greek church in Damascus—a marble screen on which, some twelve feet from the ground (to avoid dangers of iconolatry), are pictures of our Lord and his saints." Had the bishop looked farther in the church he would have seen a lower picture-stand, on which pictures are daily placed low enough down to be kissed by the people; and this is true in every Greek church.

In the Synnaxar for the first Sunday in Lent it is stated that Theophilus, the iconoclastic king (A.D. 830–40), "was smitten with an evil disease on account of his hostility to image worship; his mouth was rent open from ear to ear, and his abdominal viscera appeared; but on repenting and worshipping an image, his mouth was restored to its original state, and soon after he died." The restoration of image worship by his widow Theodora (A.D. 842) on the first Sunday of Lent has ever since been celebrated in the Greek Church as the feast of Orthodoxy, πανήγυρις τῆς ὀρθοδοξιας.

In the consecration of a newly painted picture the following words are used: "Send the grace of thy Holy Spirit and thy angel upon this holy image, in order that if any one pray by means of it, his request may be granted."

In a picture of the Trinity in a book published in Jerusalem, the Triune God is pictured in a group consisting of an old man, a young man, and a dove, and Anthimus, Patriarch of Jerusalem at the time, attempts to justify the shocking sacrilege in labored argument.

No wonder that Mohammedans and Jews look with horror and loathing upon such a travesty of Christianity. No wonder that multitudes of Greek Christians in Russia and Turkey, with the open Bible before them, have made haste to "come out and be separate and touch not the unclean thing." Can an orthodox creed and historic antiquity justify such a glaring crime against God as this shameless idolatry?

X. The Mariolatry of the Greek Church is also a grievous error and a stumbling-block in the way of Mohammedans.

The Greek Church believes that saints have not yet entered heaven, being in the limbus until the day of resurrection, and yet addresses prayers to them as mediators and intercessors with God. The sole intercession of Jesus Christ is repudiated, and Mary and the saints exalted into his place. The following petitions are culled from the Greek Prayer-Book (Horologion): Page 678: "We are lost through our many sins, turn us not away disappointed, for thou alone art our only hope." Page 680: "Deliver us from all our distresses, for we take refuge in thee. We offer our souls and minds to thee." Page 704: "Oh, thou who didst bear Jesus Christ, purge me with hyssop by thine intercession, for I am very vile." "Oh, thou who alone art the hope of Christians." "O Lady, most holy mother of God, grant that I may praise, bless, and glorify thee all the days of my life." "Oh, thou who art worthy of all praise, save from future punishment those who cry unto thee, Alleluia."

The use of this word Alleluia (praise ye Jehovah) shows that the Greek Church in plain terms deifies the Virgin Mary, thus justifying the charge of gross polytheism brought by Mohammed against the Christianity of his day, and, as Sir William Muir justly says, " By the cry, 'There is no God but God alone,' to trample under foot the superstitions, picture worship, and Mariolatry that prevailed. For example, see in the Koran, Sura V., v. 125, 'And when the Lord shall say, O Jesus, son of Mary, didst thou say unto men, Take me and my mother for two Gods beside God? He shall answer, God forbid; it is not for me to say that which is not the truth.' "

The Mohammedans everywhere believe that the Trinity is a blasphemous elevation of a woman to a place in the Godhead. Is it strange that the Mariolatry of the Greek and Latin churches has become a "rock of offence" to the whole Mohammedan world?

Space will not allow our giving details as to the worship of relics, and the prayers offered to the wood of the cross, and the brutal deception of the holy fire, annually sanctioned and promoted by the patriarch, bishops, and priests of Jerusalem as a proof of the orthodoxy of the Greek Church. The patriarch admits it to be a fraud and an imposture, and yet sanctions it because the revenues need it and the people will have it.

The Greek Church stands condemned from its own authorized symbols as polytheistic, idolatrous, and unscriptural. It deserves all the denunciations hurled by Huss and Luther, Wickliffe and Knox upon the abominations of Rome.

What, then, is Reformed Protestant Christendom to do in view of these two great facts, the duty of Christianizing the Mohammedan world and the obstacles interposed by the idolatries of nominal Christians living among them?

The Oriental churches need the Gospel in its purity. How shall it be given to them?

I. One view has been to effect an outward ecclesiastical union between these sects and Protestant Christianity, on the basis of admitting the truth they hold, without agitating the question of their errors. The fatal objection to this is its absolute impracticability.

Union of Protestants with the Greek Church on the basis of intercommunion can never be effected, the Greek Church remaining as it is, until all Protestants have submitted to trine immersion by a Greek priest. The concession must be all on one side. Let this be borne in mind, and the advocates of union with the Greek Church may be saved much needless mortification.

The modern attempts at fraternization with the Greek Church by Protestant bishops, canons, and clergy have only increased the contempt of the Greek clergy for Protestantism and their attachment to the traditions and superstitions of their fathers. After an address by a zealous Anglican in the Greek school in Beirut, full of laudation of the Greek Church, the young people were heard saying, Why should we not worship the Virgin and the saints and the holy pictures, for the Church of England approves it? As the venerable translator of the Bible into Arabic, the Rev. Dr. Van Dyck, recently wrote to an Anglican clergyman: " Union with the Greek Church is easy enough. Let the archbishops, bishops, and other clergy of the Church of England accept rebaptism and reordination at the hands of a Greek priest, together with the holy chrism; let the higher clergy put away their wives and live a celibate life, and let the rank and file of the English Church be rebaptized, adopt Mariolatry and picture worship, and all the idolatries of the Greek Church, and union will be easy enough, but on no other terms."

II. Another plan proposed is to reform the higher ecclesiastics and through them the people. The twelve labors of Hercules were slight compared with such a task. The patriarchs and bishops of the East are, as a class, wealthy, avaricious, masters of political intrigue, unscrupulous, and trained to hierarchical tyranny over the consciences of men, and will probably be the last class in the East to accept the Gospel in its simplicity. There are a few noble exceptions, men who would gladly hail a reformation, but find their hands tied and their efforts thwarted by the iron fetters of ecclesiastical despotism. The Greek Church is bound hand and foot to the Church of Greece and Russia, with whom tradition is supreme. No change in liturgies, prayers, doctrines, and usages would be possible without a council of the four patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria and the holy Synod of Russia, and such a council, for such an object, is about as likely as a council at Rome to abolish the papacy, or a council at Mecca to abolish Islam.

There is no evidence that the clergy desire a reform, and the laity have no voice. Archæolatry, avarice, and political power form a threefold cord which will not be easily broken. The mass of the clergy are ignorant and immoral, utterly indifferent to spiritual reform, and the ignorant laity, whose war-cry in their contests with the Latins is the infallibility of the first Seven Councils, would mob their clergy if they proposed to cast out the pictures from the churches.

Simony and moral dishonesty are notorious among the higher clergy. In August, 1891, an intrigue was carried on by a high Greek ecclesiastic in Jerusalem to purchase the patriarchal chair of Antioch (in Damascus and Beirut) by the payment of £10,000, and the endowment of the chair with nearly £90,000 on his death.

It is humiliating to see godly men in the Protestant Church of England proposing to fraternize with such Oriental ecclesiastics.

III. A third scheme has been suggested and faithfully tried. It proposes to preach the Gospel and give the Bible to the people, leaving them in their own ecclesiastical relations, in the hope of reforming the Church from within.

This plan has been patiently tried in Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor without success. It is still on trial among the Nestorians. It has been found in the countries first named that no sooner do men read the Bible and know Christ experimentally, no sooner do they compare the New Testament Church with the rites, ceremonies, and priestly systems of the Oriental churches, than they make haste to "come out and be separate." Enlightened New Testament students will not pray to a creature or worship a painted board. Nor, if they wished it, would their priests allow them to remain in a church whose laws they disobey.

The result has been that the people themselves have demanded and compelled the organization of a new Oriental Evangelical Church. This has been done in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor. It has vindicated the claims of Christianity to be a pure non-idolatrous religion. Mohammedans can see the Bible acted out in life in the teaching and practice of the Protestant churches. They are now beginning to believe that the Bible does not sanction idolatry, and that the Oriental churches have gone astray from the truth.

In the agreement in 1850 between Baron Bunsen and Archbishop Sumner with regard to the Jerusalem bishopric it is said:

"Duty requires a calm exposition of scriptural truth and a quiet exhibition of scriptural discipline; and where it has pleased God to give his blessing to it and the mind has become emancipated from the fetters of a corrupt faith, there we have no right to turn our backs upon the liberated captive and bid him return to his slavery or seek aid elsewhere."

This is a clear, calm, and Christian statement of the case. The 20,000 communicants in the Protestant churches of the Turkish Empire are simply "liberated captives."

These Protestant churches are the "Sierra Leone" and the "Frere Town" in this dark Africa of Oriental sacerdotalism. An open Bible and a free salvation through faith in Christ are the right and the refuge of all these enslaved populations.

On the basis of Archbishop Sumner's noble utterance, the Church Missionary Society has pursued its admirable course of evangelization in Palestine for the last fifty years. It has opened schools, organized churches, and sowed the good seed of the Gospel. The sainted Bishops Gobat and Barclay followed the instructions of their archbishop, and welcomed many a liberated captive to the fold of Christ. A self-denying and conscientious band of missionaries, amid difficulties and obstacles found perhaps nowhere else on earth, amid a population demoralized and pauperized and perverted by the wholesale almshouse system of Greeks, Latins, Armenians, Moslems, and Jews who feed and house their adherents and thus well-nigh extinguish every spark of manliness and self-respect, have, in spite of such an environment, ennobled the name of Protestant Christianity, testified boldly to Moslems, Greeks, and Jews of a higher and purer faith than any they have known, and, by the assiduous labors of the preacher, the teacher, the physician, the Biblewoman, the faithful nurse, and the colporteur, not a few of whom labor at their own charges, laid the foundations of a spiritual reformation, for which all God's people should offer hearty thanksgiving.

And now these good men and women, some of whom have grown gray in the missionary work, are taken to task for "proselytizing" among the adherents of the Holy Orthodox Church. The public press and missionary periodicals are full of the conflict raging between opposing policies of missionary work in Palestine. The Church Missionary Society, whose object is to "seek and to save that which was lost," advocates the principles of Archbishop Sumner, the same which have been acted on by all the American missions in Turkey since 1820.

The extreme Sacerdotal party, headed by Archdeacon Denison, advocate a policy so extraordinary that one can only explain it on the ground of ignorance of history, ancient and modern, or a blind infatuation.

They sent a memorial, July 5th, 1891, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, representing:

"I. That English clergymen cannot legitimately labor for the conversion of Jews and Mohammedans in Syria and Palestine without due mission and jurisdiction, to be given by the Orthodox Territorial Episcopate.

"II. We observe with grave apprehension the prevalence of an opinion that English clergymen engaged in this work (whether with or without mission, as aforesaid) may lawfully, so long as they abstain from active proselytizing, receive into their congregations members of the Orthodox Church who are discontented with the ministrations of their lawful pastors. This proceeding seems to us to be a direct encouragement of a schismatical temper. They therefore anxiously hope

"III. That no English clergyman will be allowed in the future so to receive any Orthodox Christian, whether child or adult, without the express permission of his lawful pastor.

"IV. That all who have been so received in the past will be urged to obtain such permission, or, failing this, to return to their allegiance.

"V. That no English clergyman will be allowed to undertake any spiritual work in Palestine without express commission from the Orthodox patriarch or bishop, granted to him either immediately or mediately through the Anglican bishop resident at Jerusalem.

"VI. That in order to obviate all appearance of the exercise of independent jurisdiction by any English bishop in Syria or Palestine, the use of such terms as diocese, or commissary or archdeacon, and the creation of anything approaching to diocesan organization be avoided."

One needs documentary evidence to prove that Protestant clergymen in the nineteenth century would sign such a document as the above; yet it is signed by 4 archdeacons, 17 canons, and 68 clergymen—89 in all.

A question arises in the outset, Why should such devotees of legitimatism and Episcopal prerogatives ignore, in such an insulting manner, the ancient and historic Armenian and Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem?

And why, if the Greek clergy have historic right to the territory, and are qualified to do all diocesan, parochial, and missionary work in Western Asia, should an Anglican bishop invade the sacred precincts even as a resident?

And why, if Bishop Blyth must obtain "due mission and jurisdiction" to labor for Jews and Moslems, should he not carry the matter to its logical conclusion, and ask for "legitimate" baptism and "legitimate" ordination at the hands of the Greek bishop? This would simplify the whole matter and at least secure the existence of one godly bishop among the Oriental clergy; and then, on his next visit to England, the new Græco-Anglican bishop could rebaptize and reordain the whole 89 memorialists, and relieve their minds of any doubt as to their orthodoxy.

But seriously, this memorial is a logical and consistent view from the sacerdotal standpoint.

The Orthodox Episcopate is everything. Simony, immorality, unscriptural teaching, idolatry, and Mariolatry are nothing—mere trifles. The fact that for twelve hundred years this haughty hierarchy has done nothing for the conversion of Moslems and Jews, and has cared to do nothing, and that its gross idolatries have made Mohammedans hate and spit upon the name of Christianity—all this is of no account.

These hierarchs have the only legitimate right to preach the Gospel to perishing Jews, Moslems, and pagans in all Western Asia and Northern Africa. If they do not preach, no matter. If their preaching would be a scandal and a shame, no matter. If they preached and prayed, asking that "the lips" of every Anglican clergyman and layman "be struck dumb" as impious hypocrites, because they will "not worship St. Luke's picture of the Virgin Mary," no matter. They are legitimate. If they keep Moslems and Jews—yes, and their own deluded followers—out of eternal life, it is well, for the great object of a legitimate ecclesiastical system "is not the saving of immortal souls, for whom Christ died, but the maintenance of a machine for its own sake."*

This narrow sacerdotal spirit would have kept Peter and Paul and James out of the "legitimate" synagogues where they preached Christ and denounced Judaism, and handed over the salvation of the world, or what would be more important, the conservation of Orthodox Judaism, to the "legitimate" chief priests, Scribes, and Pharisees. It would denounce Huss and Luther and Wickliffe as pestilent proselytizers.

Let us thank God that this spirit is not the dominant spirit of the Church of Christ, and that this memorial represents only an insignificant fraction of the clergy of the Church of England.

---

* The *Record*, July 10, 1891.

The spread of light and Bible knowledge among the youth of the Greek community in Syria is rapidly bringing them into a critical position. Two tendencies are manifest: The first is toward infidelity. They say the Orthodox Greek Church claims to be the only true church, but it is corrupt beyond hope of reform, so we will have done with all religion. Family ties and traditions, pride of name and pecuniary interests keep them in outward connection with the Church, while they laugh at its superstitions and despise its hierarchy. This class are rapidly lapsing into French infidelity.

The second is among the more thoughtful and conscientious, who, in despair of reforming the errors of the old Church, break away from all connection with it and embrace Protestantism.

Here they find freedom from hierarchical domination, liberty of conscience, an open Bible, and a pure, non-idolatrous doctrinal system. No more priestly absolution, transubstantiation, picture worship, cross worship, adoration of the Virgin, and invocation of the saints. They accept the doctrine of justification by faith and are at rest.

To receive such men into the Protestant communion, however it may be stigmatized by Archdeacon Denison as "proselytism," is dignified by a greater than the archdeacon, even Archbishop Sumner, as receiving "liberated captives."

It is the delightful privilege of the Christian missionary to give such men a hearty and fraternal welcome.

Bishop Blyth, in a conversation with Rev. H. E. Fox, of Durham, England, defined "proselytism to be unfair pressure to persuade a man to leave one church for another." Where the bishop has met with that type of proselytizing I am at a loss to conjecture. During a residence of thirty-five years in the East, I have not met it among either English or American missionaries.

The Jesuits notoriously practise it. and are making rapid inroads upon the Oriental churches. I have known an Anglican clergyman of sacerdotal tendencies to labor for two hours to persuade a stanch Protestant in Beirut, who was born and baptized a Protestant, to enter the Greek Church, but I do not believe that either the Presbyterian or Church of England missionaries in Western Asia use "unfair" means to draw men into the Protestant churches. I was recently riding in the French omnibus from Beirut to Aaleih in Mount Lebanon. My fellow-passengers were Greek, Maronite, and Greek Catholic gentlemen from Beirut. A young Greek Effendi of well-known ability entered into a discussion of the comparative systems of instruction in the Protestant and Jesuit schools. Said he, "Our Greek boys go to the Jesuit College. They are taught daily the Romish doctrines, the Pope, the Church of Rome, and the errors of the Greek schism. It is drilled and beaten into them, and yet, as a fact, hardly one of the Greek boys ever becomes a Jesuit. We also send boys to the American College and seminaries. Nothing is said about Protestantism or the Greek Church. There is no attack on picture worship or the worship of the Virgin. Only the Bible is taught and Bible truth is preached, and the result is that the great part of our young men become Protestants." I believe that the testimony of Nejeeb Effendi will be corroborated by that of every intelligent man in the country.

The vast accessions to Protestantism from among the Oriental churches have been occasioned by the working of the Gospel leaven in the hearts and minds of men.

To bid these men "return to their slavery" (to use the language of Archbishop Sumner) would be an outrage upon Christian charity, and treachery to the principles of the Gospel.

In the time of St. Paul the Jews had the Old Testament Scriptures—"Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises: whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came" (Rom. ix. 4, 5)—but they had rejected the Messiah through the traditions of the oral law, and the Gospel was to be preached to them. They were bidden to "come out and be separate."

The Greeks have the Old and New Testaments, but they have buried the living Christ under a mass of traditions and superstitions and the idolatrous decrees of that anti-Christian Seventh General Council, caricaturing the divine glories of our Lord's miraculous resurrection by the lying fraud and imposture of the blasphemous Greek fire, which makes the Moslem and Jewish enemies of Christ to blaspheme; and it is the duty of every branch of the Reformed Church to lift up its voice in protest, preach to them the pure Gospel, and when they come out and are separate and refuse to touch the unclean thing, to bid them hearty welcome to a purer church and a more orthodox doctrine.

The persecution of the Stundists in Russia, who are being exiled to Siberia with barbarous cruelty for the sole crime of studying the Bible and then refusing to attend the Greek Church, shows the underlying animus of the Greek Church everywhere.

To place ourselves on a vantage ground with the Mohammedans, we must let it be thoroughly understood that we are distinct and separate from the idolatrous Oriental churches. The Moslems look on these "Christians" as creature worshippers. They are now beginning to understand that the Protestants hold to a purer faith. Sheikh Mohammed Smair, of the Anazy Arabs, on entering our simple church in Beirut stood by my side in the pulpit, and placing his hand on the open Arabic Bible, said, "Truly, this is the house of God. There is no image or idol here, only the house of God and the Book of God."

A convert from Mohammedanism to Christianity now living in Aden, Arabia, wrote me, July, 1891, "The Romish Church here is called by Moslems, Persians, and Hindoos 'the house of the idol,' from its having in it two large marble statues. We are deeply grieved at this stumbling-block to our work among the Moslems. We ask of the Lord to remove it from our way. May his will be done!"

Any attempt at "affiliation" with an image-worshipping church will neutralize our influence with the followers of Islam. Their hostility to the worship of images and pictures is intense, and in this they find Protestant Christianity an ally.

Chinese Mohammedans have asked Protestant missionaries to speak in their mosques, as being one with them in opposition to idols and idol worship.

The Greek Church in the last twelve hundred years has written its own condemnation. Where is the list of its converts from Islam during this long period? If it be replied in apology that the Greeks have during this time been politically subject to Islam and could do no proselyting work, we reply by pointing to the Ottoman Tartar conquest of the Arabs, when the conquerors embraced the religion of the conquered.

Alas! it is too true that the Greek Church in Syria and Palestine has lost all missionary zeal and has ceased to honor the Holy Spirit, while nominally holding to his divinity. Salvation is through outward rites and the works of the law.

Does Archdeacon Denison know what the Greek Church is and has been since that idolatrous edict of the Seventh General Council?

Does he suppose that the Patriarch of Jerusalem, standing with his brilliant retinue of bishops and priests in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on the Greek Easter, and secretly lighting with a lucifer match the flame which he knows is regarded by the surging thousands of ignorant pilgrims as a veritable miraculous self lighted flame, issuing from the tomb of Christ as a proof of the divine sanction to the Greek Church—that this patriarch, whom the archdeacon says should be entrusted with the sole responsibility of converting the Moslems and the Jews, could have the face to turn to the Moslem military officers, stationed to prevent the mob of crazed fanatics from trampling each other to death, and ask them to accept the Christianity of the Greek Church as the only true faith? Would not the Moslem turn upon him with scorn and say, "Cast out your idol abominations, your burning of incense, and bowing before the 'eikons,' your invocation of saints and angels, your prayers to Mary as your 'only saviour and deliverer,' your paying of money for the deliverance of your dead, your priestly absolution, your confession to a man—abolish forever this shameful fraud of the Holy Fire, go back to the precepts of your own Tourat and Enjeel, and then come and preach to us, but not till then."

Is not a period of twelve hundred years' probation enough for the so-styled Orthodox Apostolic Church to prove its fitness for evangelizing the Mohammedans?

Does any one suppose that the Greek hierarchy of to-day, with its spirit of arrogance and persecution, its worldliness and unspirituality, is prepared or disposed to lead Moslems to Christ, the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world?

And are English missionaries, full of the spirit of Christ, of Stephen and Paul, and longing for the salvation of the perishing, holding to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and to the Word of God as the only rule of faith and practice, to refrain from preaching the Gospel to Moslems and Jews until sanction is given them by this modern Sanhedrim? Truly this is sacerdotalism run mad.

The time has come when the Church of Jesus Christ must break loose from the tyranny of churchism, and preach the Gospel as Luther did, in spite of councils and hierarchs. Our sectarian names and differences are of trifling, yea, contemptible consequence compared with the momentous character of the great work before us all in bringing the Mohammedan world to Christ.

Let us present the Gospel to Islam in its pristine purity and simplicity. Let us repudiate all alliances with human traditions and anti-Christian idolatries.

Let Protestant Christianity keep its white robes unspotted by the contamination of the unhallowed practices of these lapsed and unspiritual systems of the East.

Mohammedans believe in the Bible, and believe that Jesus, the son of Mary, is to judge the world. Let us give them the Bible and exalt the name and the redemptive work of Jesus, their "Prophet, Priest, and King."

The Oriental churches have lost the spirit which might enable them to evangelize Islam. They care not to do it. They cannot do it. They will not do it. This "kingdom" of privilege and service "shall be taken from them and given to another," even to the churches of the Reformation. Let us see to it that we are faithful to this sacred responsibility and trust.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

A PLEA FOR FAIR PLAY TOWARDS CHINA, WITH THE STATE PAPER OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT RELATIVE TO THE RECENT OUTBREAKS.

BY REV. A. P. HAPPER, D.D., LATE OF CANTON, CHINA.

A VISITOR to the United States of America from France makes the statement that France suffers in the estimation of the people of America because they see the country as she is represented by the English newspapers. This remark is pre-eminently true of China and its government. The nations of Europe and America know China very much as she is represented by the British newspapers in that country. There are some six British owned and edited newspapers there. Of these five are published daily. They also publish a weekly compilation for the *weekly* mail to Europe by the British and French steamers. The tone of the editorials in all these papers is not favorable to China. They discuss and criticise the internal administration in regard to its own subjects, its shortcomings, its injustice, as they consider it, so as to present the government in an unfavorable light. In everything relating to the conduct of the Chinese Government, where there are matters pertaining to the intercourse of China with Western nations, or the provisions of the treaties with Western powers, China is always represented to be in the wrong. China is never heard presenting these matters as it views them, or presenting the reasons for its course of action.

In the diplomatic intercourse of the nations of Europe and America all nations have their own papers, which discuss the matters which are in controversy, and the reasons which guide the policy and action of each several government are stated and made known by friendly papers. As occasion calls for it, each government publishes in a Blue Book or Yellow Book the official copies of the diplomatic correspondence which has been held on the various public matters. Thus every country of Europe and America has the opportunity of presenting the reasons for its public acts and its policy in regard to its internal and external relations, but China is never so heard in presenting the views of its own policy and government. It is true, however, that the government of China publishes some state papers for circulation among its own subjects in the Chinese language in the *Government Gazette* at Peking, which is the oldest newspaper in the world.

When the incident of the murder of the Italian prisoners in New Orleans by a crowd composed of respectable and well-to-do people, led by recognized political leaders, became known, the press of Europe was at first ready to condemn the Government of the United States of America as not fulfilling its duty to Italian subjects resident in America, according to the stipulations of the treaty with Italy. It was not until the correspondence of the American Secretary of State was published in the American newspapers and copied from them largely into the papers of the various European nations that the position and action of the American Government were understood. The diplomatic correspondence made it clear to all impartial readers that the Government of the United States had sought to fulfil her whole duty according to the stipulations of the treaty. In the light of that correspondence it is seen that a government can only be held to afford to the subjects of other countries resident in its borders the same protection it renders to its own citizens.

Many persons will be interested to read a state paper of the Chinese Government, being the translation of the memorial of the Government Office having charge of the intercourse with other countries in regard to the recent outbreaks of popular violence.

It was in answer to this memorial that the emperor issued the edict so favorable to missionaries and their work. This memorial is to be read with the knowledge that it is a communication from one department of the government to the emperor, to guide his action in the matter. It was not intended in any way to present the action of the government to Western nations in self-justification. The memorial reads thus :

"The Prince and Ministers of the Tsungli Yamên reverently submit a Memorial to the throne in which, with the view of ensuring the tranquillity of the country and the prevention of future trouble, they humbly beg that His Majesty may be pleased to issue stringent instructions to the Viceroys and Governors of the various provinces, directing them to take prompt measures for dealing with the missionary cases, which have been increasing with such persistent frequency." (Then follows a detailed statement of all the outbreaks with great particularity of detail. It is unnecessary to repeat these details here.) "All this continued trouble has had a very disquieting effect among both Chinese and foreigners. In investigating the cause of the present state of things, it will be found that it arises from the great number of disbanded soldiers and of the criminal classes connected with *secret societies,* who are to be found everywhere in the provinces bordering upon the Yangtze River. The movement is one with which the well-disposed portion of the population have nothing to do, and its object is to influence the minds of the people by the dissemination of placards, and to make use of the opportunity to create certain trouble.

"The religion of the West has for its object the inculcation of virtue, and in the Western countries it is everywhere practised. Its origin dates a long time past; on the establishment of commercial intercourse with Western powers between China and Western powers, a clause was inserted in the treaties to the effect that 'persons professing or teaching the Christian religion should enjoy full protection of their persons and property, and be allowed free exercise of their religion.' The hospitals and orphanages maintained by the missionaries all evince a spirit of benevolent enterprise. Of late years, when distress has befallen any portion of the empire, missionaries and others have never failed to come forward to assist the sufferers by subscribing money and distributing. For their cheerful readiness to do good and the pleasure they take in works of charity they assuredly deserve high commendation. Even granting that among the converts there are bad as well as good people, still they are all Chinese subjects and amenable to the jurisdiction of their own authorities, and the missionaries cannot claim the right of interfering in any disputes or lawsuits that may arise. There is no reason, therefore, why any of the people and the converts should not live together in peace and harmony. Yet mischief-makers are continually fabricating baseless stories, which they industriously propagate, until the suspicions of the people are aroused, and then lawless villains seize the opportunity to create trouble with the view of obtaining plunder. If immediate steps are not taken to prevent outbreaks of this kind, both the Chinese and foreign mercantile community will, it is to be feared, have no assurance of safety in the future, and the very important interests involved cannot fail to be seriously prejudiced. The Yamên would, therefore, pray that the Manchu General-in-Chief, the Viceroys, and Governors of all the provinces may be directed by Imperial Edict to issue proclamations clearly expounding to the people that they must on no account lend a ready ear to such false reports and wantonly cause trouble. It is the duty of the local authorities to afford protection, at all times, to the persons and property of foreign merchants and foreign missionaries, and *no relaxation* in this respect *should be permitted.*"

All candid and impartial readers will consider this an able state paper. It displays a proper concern and desire for the common safety of all. It also makes it clear that the outbreaks of violence were effected by the members of secret societies for their own purposes. The government declares its purpose to restrain these evil-doers, and takes immediate measures to protect all foreign residents and to pay indemnity for the properties destroyed. The Chinese Government do not refuse to pay for the property destroyed. They have in their whole intercourse for the last thirty years paid the demands for the property of foreigners which had been destroyed by mobs. The American Government long had in hand tens of thousands of dollars which had been paid to the United States Government to pay the claims of American citizens for property destroyed at Canton. There remained a large surplus after all claims had been settled. But what has delayed the settlement of the losses at this time has been the amount which has been claimed. The Chinese Government consider that the amount claimed is much in excess of the value of the property destroyed. The losses of Americans were paid promptly. The Chinese Government are now taking precautions against excessive claims being presented in the contingency of future losses. The government is requesting missionaries to furnish it with a statement of all buildings belonging to the mission, whether dwellings, school-buildings, or churches, with a statement of the architecture, whether European or Chinese, the number of rooms, etc., by which an estimate of the value ofthe building may be made.

When the Chinese side of the matters in dispute is heard it is evident that different principles of diplomacy are advocated by Western powers in China from what are accepted in Europe and America. It is, therefore, very desirable that the Chinese Government should be heard stating its own case when there are matters in controversy, so that both sides may be heard and a just judgment arrived at.

In a heathen country, where the difference between the native religions and Christianity is so great, and where the character of Europeans and the natives is so diverse, it cannot be otherwise but that persecutions and injury to Christians should occur. It is, therefore, necessary that the different authorities should study the things that make for peace, and avoid those things that are calculated to excite angry and revengeful feeling.

Let China be requested to rigidly prohibit the circulation of calumnies in regard to missionaries, while its government gives wide circulation to such statements about them as are made in the Imperial Edict and in the Memorial of the Office for Foreign Affairs to the emperor, as given above, and let missionaries of all communions avoid those things which are known to excite ill feeling and prejudice, and we may hope for the return of good feeling and quiet. There are many reasons to believe that the Chinese Government will be disposed to repress all outbreaks of violence; this disposition should be met by a readiness to refrain from that which, from past experience, is known to excite them.

BIBLICAL SCIENCE AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.*

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM ARNOLD STEVENS, D.D.

From *The Standard* (Bapt.), Chicago, October 22, 1891.

I.

AMONG the movements or processes that characterize modern religious history there is one which is coming daily into closer touch with the life and experience of every Christian scholar—indeed, with the experience of every earnest, thoughtful student of the Bible. This process is Biblical criticism, one phase of it being known as the higher criticism.

My theme to night is *Biblical Science and the Higher Criticism.* Assuming that we recognize the function and acknowledge the importance of Biblical science, I wish to discuss *our duty as Christian scholars in reference to the Higher Criticism;* what view we ought to take of it, and in what attitude we ought to stand towards it, in the present crisis of religious thought. May I ask your patient attention while in the plainest possible words I endeavor to show what the question at issue is, and by giving a few simple and fundamental reasons, to aid some of those who hear me in reaching an intelligent conviction as to the question of duty.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM—WHAT IS IT?

My object is first, *to show what Biblical Criticism, particularly the Higher Criticism, is;* secondly, *to make it evident that critical research is legitimate Biblical science,* and hence that it is not only to be welcomed and encouraged, but that it is obligatory upon the Christian scholar; thirdly, to state *certain principles that condition and regulate critical research;* in other words, *the criteria of legitimate Biblical Criticism.*

In this course of thought I shall be guided, and my argument will be sustained, by the words of the Apostle Paul in 1 Thes. v. 20–21: "Quench not the Spirit; despise not prophesyings; [but] prove all things; hold fast that which is good." These words were addressed to a Christian community passing through a crisis of intellectual and religious disquietude similar in some respects to that which we are experiencing—a period marked by unsettling of faith, and by doubt as to the sources of religious truth. They furnish us with an important principle of permanent application. Observe that these four clauses are not detached and separate precepts—simply four beads strung together—but are welded into one single practical and wide-reaching principle of thought. I shall not seek to expound this text; our time this evening will scarcely suffice for that, but shall appeal to it to support my argument, step by step, as I proceed.

Taking up our first question, let us ask *what Biblical Criticism, particularly the*

---

* Opening address before the Rochester Theological Seminary, Monday evening, September 7, 1891.

Higher Criticism, is. In general we may answer that it is simply a set of processes employed in the science of history. Let us remember that there *is* a science of history —a branch of knowledge entitled by its methods and results to rank among the sciences. By science I mean not mathematical or physical science, but any department of verified and systematized knowledge. History has now an acknowledged place among the sciences. Within the past century it has accomplished much in building up the great fabric of human knowledge; if we omit certain of the physical sciences its results constitute one of the principal achievements of the human mind during the last hundred years. As a science it is modern; it forms an important part of that remarkable intellectual movement and awakening distinguished in philology by the names of Bentiey and Wolf; in geography by those of Ritter and Edward Robinson, and in the field of ancient history by those of Simon, Niebuhr, Neander, Ewald, Döllinger and Lightfoot.

Now Criticism, as I have said, is simply one of the many processes employed in historical science. It is history engaged in *verifying the facts of the past.*

It is verification; the attainment of certitude as to alleged facts by the cross-examination of witnesses and the application of all possible scientific tests.

For instance, history takes up an old manuscript, or the copy of an ancient book, to ascertain the genuineness, or the purity and integrity, of its text—a line of research which is chiefly concerned with the transmission of documents. This is textual criticism, or as it is often termed Lower Criticism—being thus distinguished from the next kind of investigation to be mentioned. This next kind examines the document not as to its written or printed text, but considered *as a book*—its antecedents, its credentials, its structure. It takes a literary document and applies the tests of science in order to ascertain its date and authorship, the sources from which its author drew his story or his thought, its integrity (i.e., whether it was originally one piece of writing, the work of one author), or the credibility and general character of its testimony. This is the so-called *Higher Criticism;* applied to the Christian Scriptures it is usually called Biblical Criticism.

Or, again, the science of history may investigate any set of institutional or historic facts, in order to ascertain their true origin —the basis of reality on which they rest; for example, the origin of the jury system, or of the eucharistic supper. This is historical criticism in a still broader field.

CRITICISM IN THE DOMAIN OF HISTORY.

In other words, the function of criticism in the domain of history is to "prove all things" by the application of the resources and methods of modern discovery and science—to distinguish fact from fable, real history from supposed history. The following instances taken from secular history and literature will serve to illustrate the problems with which historical criticism has undertaken to deal.

The one most familiar, by name, is the Homeric question—the problem of the antecedents, authorship, credentials and structure of the Homeric poems, namely, the Iliad, the Odyssey, and a number of shorter poems called the Hymns.

I must not weary you even by glancing at the elements of this problem, or by indicating the progress that has been made since 1795 towards its solution. More than most persons are aware, the work of historical criticism upon this problem has been positive and constructive, and is not affected by the question of the existence or the nonexistence of the poet Homer. You can best appreciate what a revolution has been brought about in Greek philology and history, by comparing the works of Rollin, and of Gillies, that were once considered indispensable to every library, with those of Curtius or of Grote to-day, and with the more recent works on Greek literature.

For another example: In the history of the Swiss republic William Tell appears as its national hero and the founder of its independence. The story is well known. The Emperor Albert, in 1307, had determined to annex the three Forest Cantons to the ancestral domains of the House of Hapsburg. As a test of obedience, and to break the unyielding temper of the sturdy mountaineers, his governor, Gessler, had a hat placed on a pole in Altorf, to which every passer-by was required to do obeisance. Tell, cross-bow in hand, and leading his little son, defiantly refused, and being brought before Gessler, was commanded to prove his skill in archery by shooting an apple from his boy's head at the distance of eighty paces. No pleas or tears could move the tyrant; the father must shoot or both father and son must die. He shot, and the arrow split the apple into halves. But Tell had been observed to conceal an arrow under his vest. The reason being demanded, he exclaims, "To kill thee, tyrant, had I slain my boy." Gessler commands him to be taken across the lake and immured in a dungeon "where light of sun or moon shall never reach him," but from this fate he is delivered by a storm, which enables him to escape, and afterward to become the deliverer of his country by slaying Gessler.

It is only within a few years that the researches of a Swiss scholar established almost to a demonstration the thoroughly unhistorical character of the whole story, which, indeed, had been suspected and often asserted before.

One of the most remarkable instances where a myth or legend gained credence, and passed for centuries as almost unquestionable history, is that of the Pope Joan. The mediæval chronicles relate that the successor of Pope Leo IV., who died in 855, was a woman. She had come to Rome from England, or as some said, from Germany, and concealing her sex, entered the service of the church. The rapid advancement of the young man in all branches of learning brought speedy preferment, and soon the renown of incomparable wisdom and sanctity raised their possessor to the papal chair. Her pontificate came to a shameful termination, it is stated, in the year 857. Amid the solemnities of an ecclesiastical festival, as Joan was borne in procession accompanied by the highest dignitaries of the church, she was seized with travail and died in child-birth in the streets of Rome. So Papal historians related, and Protestant historians were at no pains to deny or disapprove the account.

This story is now well understood to be only one among the myriad fables of the wonder-loving and story-telling mediæval world. Its foundation was partly undermined by the French scholar Blondel, two centuries ago. But it was the work of the modern science of history in the hands of a master like Döllinger to trace its genesis, account in a measure for its origin, and detect its passage step by step from the domain of legend into that of history.

HISTORICAL CRITICISM NOT NECESSARILY DESTRUCTIVE.

In these last two instances the work of criticism has been destructive. But generally, as in the case of the Homeric poems, and in Roman history, its constructive results are far more notable and important, though in the very nature of the case they do not so impress the imagination, and are not so easily described. The result of criticism, in the case of Lysias's account of the proceedings of the Thirty Tyrants has been to confirm his testimony, and on the whole to establish the character of his orations as sources. In the case of Herodotus the positive results of criticism have been still more marked; the value and general veracity of his histories have been established beyond all question. Further on I may speak of what historical criticism has done in a positive and constructive way for the writings of Luke, or the Gospel of John.

I have spoken of it as a modern science—the birth of the eighteenth century. Not that it is a modern thing to test facts, to demand proof, to challenge testimony. Socrates did that, and so did Bacon. Peter and Thomas, the apostles, did it, and so did Paul and John. As we shall see, it was this that Paul enjoined upon the Thessalonians. The modern factor is this: The application of tests on a comprehensive scale, by a comparative and rigidly scientific method.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

The point, however, which I wish especially to emphasize in bringing to a close the first step of the discussion is this: The higher criticism is properly and legitimately *scientific research.* It seeks and it gains knowledge, verified knowledge. Let us not be disturbed by names. The word *higher,* as I have already intimated, involves no assumption of superior knowledge or acumen; it is only a technical term, as when we speak of a high school, or the higher education. Again *criticism* seems to many to imply unbelief, hostility, or denial; but surely the cross-examination of a witness in a courtroom does not of itself imply that his testimony is impeached. It *does* imply the necessity, and the difficulty also, of discrimination between truth and error; its aim is to elicit the truth. Now substitute for the word Higher Criticism, another broader term, but one which exactly describes it, *Historical Research,* and it will be one step towards removing much popular prejudice. It is not a Mephistopheles among the sciences, "Der Geist der stets verneint," *the spirit which is always denying.* It is not as one of my earliest friends has recently styled it in *The Standard,* "a mania for unsettling historical data," which, having annihilated Homer, William Tell and Shakespeare, would now win a cheap fame by assaulting the Bible. No, it is the application in the department of history and literature of what Plato would have called the *art of research* (techne exetastike), the quest of the intelligent soul for reality and truth. True, it has often fallen into the hands of charlatans and cranks—what scientific method has not? It is true that *unbelievers* have employed it to attack our faith and accomplish the overthrow of the Christian church—but what science have they not so employed?

That Biblical Criticism is not Rationalism, and is not *based* on Rationalism, I hope to show later on.

A LEGITIMATE BIBLICAL SCIENCE.

After the foregoing statement of what Bible Criticism is, of its object and scientific character, it seems almost needless to urge my second proposition, namely, that Biblical Criticism is *legitimate Biblical Science,* and as such to be welcomed and encouraged. It might seem that this was self-evident, that it were a waste of time in the presence of Christian scholars to insist on our obligation to push critical research, the higher criticism and all, into every nook and corner of Biblical history. And, taking it in the abstract there would be scarcely a dissenting voice. But let the critical process once be started; let the inquiry as to the actual facts in their objective variety be pushed into the field of sacred history by the same comparative processes that have been applied to secular history; let it be questioned whether Galatians was written from Rome (as stated by the closing verse of that epistle in the Received Text),—whether Second Peter was really written by that apostle,—whether the text concerning the three witnesses is part of the Bible,—whether the record in Joshua that "the sun stood still in the midst of heaven and hasted not to go down about a whole day" is a historical statement of a historical fact,—whether Isaiah was all written by Isaiah, or belongs to the composite documents of the Bible—let these and a thousand other similar inquiries be set on foot, and at the same time let the enemies of the church seize the instruments of research to forge them into weapons of attack,—then many who would have favored criticism in the abstract, withdraw their assent; they denounce "the critics." They assert the eternal supremacy of faith over reason or knowledge. They plant themselves upon the phrase, "the word of God," and insist, or unconsciously assume, that all Biblical investigation is to be pursued *deductively* from that single term. I might quote in illustration not only the recent deliverances at the Northfield Conference, but the words of great and good men, some of them my earliest and most honored friends. They appeal to faith—I fear sometimes to an unreasoning faith. Now, I believe with all my soul that this method is wrong—dangerously, fatally wrong.

My contention is this: The Christian scholar cannot, must not, think of science or reason as antagonistic to faith. Science is of God, as truly as revelation is of God: we have learned this lesson as far as physical science is concerned, and do not for a moment admit that any physical fact can possibly be in conflict with any revealed word. Now, historical criticism is also science. It is the ascertaining of facts by scientific methods—searching not only whether alleged facts were, but what they were. If we admit that Christianity is a historical religion, that it bases its claims ultimately upon the actual occurrence in human history of certain visible and audible events, it is idle to deny the right and the duty of ascertaining just what those events were, not only from the Bible, but from all other sources. If Protestant Christianity be true to itself and loyal to its principles, it must not disavow criticism, nor historical research in any form; it must not discourage any critic, whatever his name, who is honestly applying methods that are really scientific in order to test the reality and determine the significance of Scripture history. The prime question is one of method, not of this or that critic. I will not demand from any critical scholar, who sets about testing the genuineness of a certain document of Scripture, first to believe that that document is the word of God; or, if he seeks to ascertain the real nature of any fact related in Biblical history, first to believe in such and such a statement of it. If he doubts or denies whether Mark wrote the sixteenth chapter of his gospel, or whether the apostle Peter wrote our Second Peter, I would say at once: This inquiry is a legitimate one: let us ascertain the facts from all sources, and so far as they can be ascertained, let us apply them frankly and openly in our exegesis.

Now I ask, is not this the reasonable procedure? Is it not the method of honest inquiry? In reply you may put the question to me. Is it the method of Christian faith? Is it scriptural? The text which I quoted at the beginning of my address is but one out of many passages going to show that it is the method sanctioned by our Lord and his apostles.

II.

The question at issue, I repeat, is one of *method,*—not whether this and that critic is evangelical and orthodox, not whether this or that theory concerning Isaiah or any other book of the Bible is a true theory. Now is the critical method of historical research that I have defined Scripturally justified?

"But prove all things:" the apostle enjoins upon the Thessalonian church the duty of investigation and proof in matters of Christian truth. "All things"—all thought and all fact that reach us through human sources are to be proved, subjected to the tests of reason. "*All* things:" some admit the right and duty of investigation in human science, but not in the science of things divine—in the domain of physical truth, but not in the domain of Biblical truth. They hold that where the written revelation begins reason ends, and proof is not to be sought for. Our text does not sanction this distinction. Prophesyings, matters of religious revelation, are the very matters of which the apostle is speaking. One outstanding, and in the early church unquestioned, fact, was the immediate and manifest agency of the Holy Spirit;—it was his voice that was heard through prophets who communicated his messages and issued his commands. But even prophetic revelations were not wholly self-evidencing, nor was there any clearly defined line of demarkation between the divine message on the one hand, and human erroneous interpretation, or even human imposture, on the other. It was often difficult to distinguish the divine and the human element in the message of a true prophet, and probably still more difficult to distinguish between the true and the false prophet. It was an age (the age of Paul) of false miracles, of forgeries, of spiritual imposture, and of all manner of charlatanism and legerdemain in matters of religion. Hence the Apostle Paul, as this letter to the Thessalonians shows, found it necessary to warn the churches against spurious epistles purporting to come from himself, and also against pretended communications from the spiritual world.

"But prove all things:" this "but" (which is not, but should be, in our English Bibles) in our text should not be disregarded. It subordinates this precept to those which precede, and reminds us that while intellectual investigation is a duty, it is not the first nor the highest.

EXEGESIS IMPLIES HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

In order to define my position more sharply this is further to be said: Exegesis implies criticism; there can be no exegesis worthy the name of science without it. This means that we are not simply to take the Bible and learn from it what the facts of history are, but also to take those facts and learn from them what the Bible is. For instance, in the much-mooted question of the enrolment under Quirinius, related in the second of Luke. We cannot decide it by assuming as final the absolute accuracy of Luke. If from other sources we can ascertain in just what years Quirinius was governor of Syria, whether he was governor once or twice, and further to what years that imperial census belongs, we shall not only be enabled to put the right interpretation upon Luke's language, but also be enabled to pronounce upon the greater or less accuracy of his narrative.

To take another instance: I am asked, as an interpreter of the New Testament, whether our Lord himself has not decided the Pentateuchal problem for us. In John v. 46, 47, we read his words to the Jews: "For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Here "his writings" can only be understood as referring to the Pentateuch. Now does not the language of our Lord forever debar a Christian scholar from raising the question whether the Pentateuch is a composite document, or wholly the work of Moses? At the beginning of my Biblical studies I should have considered this passage decisive. But I have learned the danger of taking any passage of Scripture to teach that which it was not originally intended to teach. I have learned it to be in the very nature of human speech that its first and obvious sense is not necessarily its true sense, and that one of the most difficult tasks of the interpreter is to distinguish between the teaching of Scripture, and his own inferences from that teaching. Hence I hold that in this and in all similar cases, in order to know what our Lord's conception of the fact was, what he meant to say and what he did say, it is first incumbent upon us by all possible research to ascertain what the given fact was.

This is the kind of research justified and encouraged by our Lord himself, as well as by his apostles, in order that doubt might be removed, and the assurance and strength of personal conviction take its place. Even the fact of the resurrection, the foundation-fact of our faith, the Saviour did not require Thomas to believe without evidence. He had no words of praise for Thomas's doubt, yet he willingly furnished the sort of evidence necessary to remove that doubt.

In the case of any fact which comes to us through human testimony, it is legitimate for us to apply the principles of historical science, freely and impartially, in order to test the evidence therefor. Let me add, before concluding this portion of my argument, that in urging this point, it is Christian *scholars* I am addressing. Investigation, weighing of evidence, criticism—these are not the first nor highest Christian duty, nor are they the duty of every Christian. But if there is to be any Biblical science at all, if the Christian scholar has any high or worthy mission in the upbuilding of the church and hastening the triumph of Christ's kingdom, critical research will forever have its rightful place in Christian theology.

A MORAL AIM MUST REGULATE THE CRITICAL METHOD.

Let us now consider, in the third place, certain *principles that condition and regulate critical research.* From the point of view of evangelical Christian scholarship there are in the very nature of the case certain *criteria of legitimate biblical criticism.* The following three we may derive from the Apostle Paul's words.

First, *biblical criticism must be dominated by a moral purpose.* "Hold fast that which is good," is the apostle's precept. Reason has its claims, but reason—the critical intellect—is made, in the constitution of the soul, subject to conscience. Let me try to explain the bearing of this principle. Observe that the apostle does not say, Hold fast to that which is true, but to that which is good, (*To kalon.*) *To kalon* is the morally true, the nobly true. Every historic fact has its moral side; we are to see that side; it is the moral significance of events that we are to seize upon and appropriate. The biblical criticism that renounces the moral aim may be useful in collecting data, but its verdict on the data in any crucial case carries no weight whatever in Christian theology. It is, if not an immoral, at least a non-moral, an irresponsible criticism.

The French scholar Rénan is a flagrant example. His industry is unwearied, his learning vast, his instincts are in many ways those of the true scholar. But who will affirm that the moral motive pervades and dominates his work? It is rather the æsthetic motive that rules—an æstheticism that is partly Greek and partly Parisian. His intellectual affinity, if not his sympathy, is with Nero quite as much as with Paul. He has genuine appreciation of Nero, the connoisseur of beauty—the beauty, namely, which the school of Praxiteles loved to chisel, and which one sees in alluring colors on the canvas of Gerome.

Even in Baur, a greater scholar and a nobler intellect than Rénan, this moral sense was too weak to make the highest achievement possible. Baur did not fail to see that the conversion of Paul was a crucial fact in history, but in interpreting it he failed to recognize its full ethical character—that it was not only a change of opinion, but a revolutionary change of character. That majestic moral phenomenon, what the Apostle Paul himself calls "a new creation," was the *To kalon* which the great scholar did not appropriate, and thus being ignorant of, or ignoring, the full significance of the moral fact, laid the very foundation of the Tübingen school in error.

It is the vice of such criticism that it is too easily satisfied with negations. It requires no religious postulates to start with, it has no moral goal in view. Reuss's remark with reference to the earlier rationalistic school in Germany, "It had no aspiration after the ideal," applies to most of its successors. Its methods and its tendencies were necessarily destructive. On the other hand, fidelity to a moral aim naturally involves constructive effort, both in an intellectual and an ethical sense. "Let us follow after things whereby we may edify one another"—that is, build up our common faith and life.

PROPHECY.

The second condition and principle of critical research is *the recognition of prophecy.* "Despise not prophesyings." Wonderful, is it not, how the words of Paul are in touch with our modern thought! As you are well aware, the vital point to-day in every system of biblical theology is the question of prophecy. As to miracle, Christian theology on one hand, and science and philosophy on the other, have in our day come to a better understanding; a truer conception of nature and a truer conception of miracle have alike been gained, and many have come to understand that supernatural law may interpenetrate the physical order of nature without violating the harmony of the universe.

At present it is not so much a miraculous Christianity which is denied, as a prophetic Christianity—a prophetic and predictive Christian revelation. That which we call prophecy—was it merely extraordinary intuition in extraordinary crises of an extraordinary people? Is it on its human side only discovery? Will Carlyle's definition of the prophet satisfy us—the man of insight into the inner reality of things, the original, the sincere man, his message being God's message simply because he sees things as they are, and therefore voices the eternal verities? That will define Plato, Newton, Æschylus, Dante: it will not define Elijah, claims to have been in actual converse with the living, personal God, that there has been a direct disclosure to himself of attested certainties from a sphere beyond his own consciousness and reason.

Here is a distinct issue between a believing church and rationalism. Rationalism, in the proper historic sense of the term, defining a well-known school of thought, denies the fact and the authority of prophecy; or else, in order not to deny, constructs a new definition of prophecy which leaves out its distinctive features. Now any school of critics which adopts rationalism as its working principle violates at the outset one of the fundamental conditions of scientific method. It adopts at the beginning of a purely historical investigation postulates which are foreign to the sphere of the science of history, and which may evidently render it impossible for the critic to deal impartially with the testimony. When a Biblical scholar like Oort (of the Holland school to which Kuenen belongs) assumes that the Biblical prophets, when they said, "Thus saith the Lord," or "The Lord spake to me," were simply employing rhetorical figures, just such as any poet might use to set forth a thought of his own—this is not legitimate Biblical criticism, but deistic philosophy, a denial outright of a fundamental and essential conception not only in Christianity but in spheres of thought outside of Christianity.

THE AGENCY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Our third principle of critical research is still more broadly and distinctly exclusive of rationalism. It requires *the recognition of the immediate agency within the Christian church of the personal Holy Spirit.* "Quench not the Spirit." These words lay down the base line of all Christian research in the field of exegetical theology; it is legitimate in another department of scientific theology to challenge and to test this postulate, but not to Biblical criticism and exegesis, as I have defined their function. I would lay the emphasis in this whole discussion just where the apostle has laid it in the text I have been quoting. "Quench not the Spirit," stands imperatively first.

I have said that this principle excludes rationalism. I mean rationalism in its recognized historic sense, as opposed to supernaturalism, the principle which in religion makes its ultimate appeal to man's mind, whether to reason or to conscience. It denies, what supernaturalism affirms, a personal communication of authoritative truth made by God the Spirit directly to chosen men. There are degrees of rationalism, and it is often difficult to classify thinkers or schools of thought, but the difference between the rationalistic principle and that which is regulative of Christian thought is fundamental; the chasm between them cannot be bridged. The former is always in the very nature of the case either practically deistic or atheistic. Rationalism, if it meant simply independent thought over against blind submission to the authority of a priest or a church, would be that for which Protestant Christianity has stood from the beginning. But it is now well understood to mean something else. It allows no supremely authoritative word from God the Spirit, and it explains Christianity by purely natural causes, either eliminating the supernatural in history and prophecy, or else (which comes to the same thing), by breaking down the distinction between the natural and the supernatural. This principle, I say, is in the very nature of the case either deistic or atheistic; it cannot logically remain in the Christian church. Dr. Briggs in the course of a recent article in the *North American Review*, after defining rationalists as those who "make the reason supreme, goes on to divide the Christian church into "three great parties, evangelicals, churchmen, and rationalists." In other words, rationalism is one of three schools of *Christian* thought. We cannot accept this classification, nor what it implies. Every clear thinker must see, as Strauss saw from the start, that rationalism and historic Christianity are mutually exclusive and antagonistic. The rationalist cannot logically stay in the Christian church.

TOWARDS THE LIGHT.

I must conclude without laying before you, as I had hoped to do, some of the exegetical and constructive results of Biblical criticism upon the writings, especially the Gospel of John. In "Watkins's Bampton Lectures for 1890," and in the first volume of "Godet's Commentary on John," may be found some most instructive reading on this topic. We may be sure, let me add, that the higher criticism, in the proper sense of the term, is not rationalism, is not infidelity, is not an enemy to the faith or to the church. We owe it partly to the work which it has accomplished within sixty years that we are to day able to understand the meaning and the mission of this wonderful Gospel of John as they have never been understood before during eighteen Christian centuries.

I know that this period of questioning and research is fraught with danger to the faith of many; but we shall not protect or establish the faith of the church by putting questioning and research under ban. I know that questions are being raised which it will take long to answer. But it is the daily joy of the Christian scholar that his face is towards the light. "Ye shall know the truth"—his eye is fixed on that promise. Only we may not expect all the truth at once. It belongs to our earthly probation that we must often obtain the truth by disentangling it from the error with which it is perpetually interwoven. We find that the best men sometimes teach error, and that men who are not the best have sometimes become the advocates of an overlooked or a forgotten truth. Let us take care not to encourage in the ministry or in the church a religious agnosticism, sincere but narrow-minded and unreasoning. Let us distinguish between science and science falsely so called, remembering that the advance of all true science is in the interest of Christ's kingdom; knowing that it marches slowly, the windows of the soul open to light from every quarter of the heavens, let us toil and pray for that reasoned conviction as to the fundamental facts and doctrines of Christianity which is the privilege and high reward of the Christian student, and which the writers of the New Testament labored to produce. I have written "that thou mightest know *the certainty* concerning the things wherein thou hast been instructed," says the evangelist Luke, "*having traced the course of all things accurately from the first*,"—one of the early instances of historical research. John, perhaps even more than any other of the New Testament writers, lays stress on intelligent conviction as distinguished from mere hearsay and traditional knowledge. But it is above all in the words of our Lord himself that we have held up before us the ideal of an apostolic ministry in this matter—namely, that we may be able to say, in the presence both of a believing church and an unbelieving world, "We speak that we do know, we testify that we have seen."

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND'S EXPERIMENT.

STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF INSTRUCTION KIEHLE THINKS THE FARIBAULT MOVE WAS WISE AND WITHIN THE LAW.—FULL TEXT OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT'S RECENT CIRCULAR.

From the *New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register*, October 31, 1891.

ST. PAUL, MINN., Oct. 21.

STATE Superintendent Kiehle, in view of the fact of the conversion of several parochial into public schools, has issued a circular for the guidance of school boards and teachers in reference to such matters in which he says:

A Board of Education may not lawfully bind themselves to require or apply any religious test in the selection of teachers; neither may they distribute or classify pupils in departments, grades or classes according to their religious faith. To do so would have no other explanation than the purpose to propagate the tenets of a distinctive Christian sect. And what may not be done directly, may not be done by indirection, that is, the board may not occupy the apartments of a parochial school and have control of it with an implied or unexpressed understanding that the teachers shall be selected from those of a particular religious body, or that the children of a particular sect shall be sent there. Such an understanding must be regarded as sacredly binding by all honorable persons, and in the eye of the law and bar of public sentiment, would be condemned as a violation of the law, and would, therefore, work a forfeiture of all rights to any share in the public funds. The Board of Education must be absolutely free in the exercise of its authority for the organization and conduct of a good public school; and if the results are not satisfactory, the board must not be able to say that they were limited by implied conditions which the public understood and approved.

QUESTIONS OF EXPEDIENCY.

Beyond limitations and duties determined by the statute, there are many other questions which must be determined by the board consistently with the purpose for which the school is maintained. Some of those have religious elements and others have not. For example:

First.—The Bible is a religious book, and as such it has no place in the public schools to promulgate religious doctrines; but, having merit of great historical, moral and literary value, it may be used for these qualities. If, however, to any class of patrons, this is obnoxious, the board should require the discontinuance of its use.

Second.—Sisters of Charity are religious persons, and, as such, have no place in the public school to promulgate religious doctrines; but if they be women of education and teaching ability, it lies wholly within the authority of the Board of Education to employ them to do the legitimate work of the school. If, however, to any class of patrons their presence is obnoxious or unacceptable by reason of the significance of their religious garb, the board must either retire them or require them to wear the usual garb of teachers in the school-room.

Third.—The same principle requires that in case the color, or nationality, or personal peculiarities of a teacher otherwise well qualified, make him so unacceptable to patrons as to interfere with the purposes of the school, his employment must be discontinued.

Fourth.—While the public funds and public property may not be used to propagate religious doctrine, the interest which the State has in all voluntary organizations of a benevolent and philanthropic nature has always disposed it to allow such bodies any use of its buildings that would in no wise interfere with their public use. In country districts it has been customary from time immemorial to allow the use of school houses for religious worship and Sabbath schools, as well as other meetings. This practice is one of expediency and propriety to be decided by the judgment of the board.

THE FARIBAULT SCHOOLS.

In view of the public importance of the action at Faribault, I have visited the schools there, and by the courtesy of the Board of Education and the City Superintendent have become acquainted with the plan and purpose of the board in accepting the pupils of the parochial schools under their supervision. I feel warranted in expressing to the public my entire confidence that the board have acted intelligently and in no way to compromise their authority as public officers; that they have used their independent and best judgment in the choice of teachers, in grading and promoting pupils, and that they are determined to give the children in these grades advantages equal to others in the city.

This experiment, for such it is, is being conducted in such a spirit of consideration that if, at the end of the year, the Catholics conclude to reassume the education of their children, it will be done without disturbing the friendly relations of mutual respect which now prevail.

D. L. Kiehle,
Superintendent Public Instruction.

THE ENTERING OF THE WEDGE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

From *The Examiner* (Bapt.), New York, November 12, 1891.

It is well and necessary that the American people be kept informed of the real significance of the latest Roman Catholic attack upon our public school system. I speak my profound conviction when I say that there is no subtler, more encroaching, more determined antagonist of our Republican institutions than the hierarchy of this Roman Church. The last form of attack by this hierarchy upon the foundation institution of our republic—the public school—is that of a so-called transfer of the Roman Catholic Parochial School to the custody of the Board of Education of the public school. The instances in point are such so-called transfers of parochial schools in Faribault and Stillwater, in the State of Minnesota.

THE ROMANISTS PLEASED.

Precisely what does such transfer mean in the eyes of the Roman Catholic hierarchy? Fortunately it is possible to record. Fortunately a member of that hierarchy has declared himself. The *Northwestern Chronicle* is a Roman Catholic paper, published weekly in St. Paul. Its editor is the Roman Catholic priest, Rev. John Conway. I quote from an editorial on the matter in that paper: "The *Catholic Citizen*, of Milwaukee, says that the agreement come to between the Catholics of Faribault, through Father Conway on the one hand, and the school board on the other, pleases nobody. Who is nobody? The arrangement is satisfactory to every one concerned in it. It pleases those who have the spiritual and temporal interests of Faribault at heart. It satisfies the people of the parish, the school board, the pastor, and the ordinary. Are these 'nobody'? Some criticise the arrangement who know little about it. They are either misinformed or misapprehend the situation. The Catholic children in attendance last year are there at present, but in much larger numbers. The school board has abolished ward divisions, so that the children may attend from any part of the city. The Dominican Sisters teach there. The religious emblems in the school-rooms last year are there to-day. Full provision is made by the pastor for the religious instruction of the pupils. If anything else is required by the Catholic church in the education of children, we do not know it, and yet we are scarcely without full information as to what theologians and councils and pontifical documents have said on the subject. The parents of the children think it an appreciable advantage, that whilst religion is not endangered, they are freed from all financial burdens. Nor is it a small matter to be released from a money burden of this sort."

THE POPE *vs.* THE STATE.

Consider what such so-called transfer necessarily means.

It means the segregation of the Roman Catholic children of the whole city into an essentially Roman Catholic school, supported by the State. The ward divisions of the city have been annulled, as far as this school is concerned.

An immense advantage of our public school system is the aggregation of the children of all creeds and races. So, they come to know and understand each other. So, they come to learn the width of the American citizenship of which they are the heirs. So, lines of various divisions are lessened, lost sight of. So, the supremacy of the State, and the primal duty of fealty to it, is effectually taught. Nothing is more necessary than that our conglomerate population come to the consciousness of their real unity in an American citizenship. Our population, so various and diverse in its heredity, must be made homogeneous if our republic is to stand. A supreme function of the public school is the welding together of the children of our immigrant peoples. They cannot be thus welded if they are kept apart. This so-called transfer keeps apart, and so defeats a main end of our public school system. Roman Catholic children are segregated in essentially sectarian schools supported by the State. Carry this on for generations and what must be the inevitable bloom? Such schools will teach supreme fealty to the Pope instead of chief loyalty to the State.

TO FOSTER SECTARIANISM.

Also, it is the organic law of our public school system that there be no sectarian teaching in our public schools. But, by this so-called transfer, there is steady sectarian teaching in them, even though oral, technical sectarian Roman Catholic teaching may not be given during the particular school sessions, but before and after. For consider, the sectarian emblems remain in such school-room. While, in Faribault, some of the sectarian religious emblems have been removed from the walls, the picture of the Pope remains in the most conspicuous place. In Stillwater, none of the religious emblems have been taken away. There, the parochial school buildings have not been made over to the school board, but have been simply rented by it; and a department of this so-called public school is carried on in a Roman Catholic convent hard by. Consider also, the Dominican sisters, who are the teachers, wear their distinctive, sectarian, ecclesiastical dress through all the hours of the school. Every lesson they teach is taught in this dress. Here is sectarian teaching, and of the strongest sort. It is sectarian teaching held steadily before the eyes of the impressible children. The sectarian symbols of the Roman Church wrap the children round, they cannot get away from them. Nor is it intended that they shall. Of course, there is no objection to the employment of a Roman Catholic nun as a teacher in a public school, provided while she teaches she is simply a public school teacher, and not the teacher of any special sect. But she cannot be this and wear her sectarian garb. That teaches all the time, and teaches nothing but sectarianism; can, from the nature of the case, teach nothing else, and sectarian religious emblems teach sectarianism as well, and the State pays for such sectarian teaching in a so-called public school! It would be hard to discover a more flagrant violation of the organic law swaying righteous sceptre over our public school system. And the result is that the Roman Catholic Church gets the sectarian teaching it is determined on, and gets the State to pay for it! So, to the fundamental law of the State, the Roman Church is disloyal when it can win for itself advantage. The truth is, such whole transfer business is the capitulation of our public school system to the sectarian uses of the Roman Church. Let such surrender go on and your public school system is disintegrated, broken up, annihilated. And that such shall at last, somehow, be the issue, is the inflexible and plotting purpose of this Roman Church.

Public opinion needs to be informed, aroused, girded. The foundation of the Republic is the public school. To destroy this foundation, this immigrant church is sedulously striving. Beware of the entering of the wedge!

Minneapolis, Minn., November, 1891.

THE CHRISTIAN HELL.

BY JAMES MEW.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), November, 1891.

In one of his moral essays, Pope speaks of a 'soft dean' who never mentioned hell to 'ears polite,' and adds, in a note, 'This is a fact.' The 'soft dean' appears, from the *Guardian* of the 31st of March, 1713, to have been an eminent divine, 'most exactly well-bred,' who told his congregation at Whitehall that, if they did not 'vouchsafe to give their lives a new turn, they must certainly go to a place which he did not think fit to name in that courtly audience.' All men have not been so delicate as Pope's dean, and there are very respectable precedents in literature for calling in this matter a spade a spade.

Hell has appeared as well in the names of persons as in the names of places and of streets. An infernal topography would not be devoid of interest. A gambling-house is still commonly called a hell. The Hell Fire Clubs are notorious. In the seventeenth century they were also numerous. They were full of 'diabolical profaneness and immorality, and frequented by reckless and abandoned characters of both sexes.' One of these sodalities consisted of the famous Monks of Medmenham Abbey, or the Monks of St. Francis, among whom were Dashwood, Paul Whitehead the poet, and Wilkes. Another was founded by Colonel St. Leger, or Sallenger. Another is said to survive in the Phœnix at Brasenose.

Of hell as a place of punishment the natural history is not only interesting, but instructive. As a subject of evolution, it comes well within the sphere of scientific inquiry. The chief difficulty about it is the vastness of its literature. The startling bibliography of religious terrorism makes us sigh for the simplicity of the hell of the Japanese, where the only punishment of the wicked is to pass into the body of a fox, or for that of the Talapoins of Surat, in which the absence of what Addison calls 'the fair sex' is the most excruciating torment of the imagination.

Herbert Spencer, in his *Principles of Sociology,* has shown how, from the primitive notions of the primitive man, the notions of sleep, and swoon, and dream, the ideas of ghosts, souls, devils, resurrection, and another life in another world, have gradually and successively been evolved. The conditions of being in the unseen and imagined world of hell are varied. In Patagonia it is not regarded as a place of misery. In Mexico it is less a place of punishment than of relative discomfort. Thus, a not undesirable Hades may differentiate into a Valley of Hinnom, and a dreary region of negative felicity into a Tartarus of positive pain.

The general conception of hell, a conception primarily based on curiosity and fear, has been elaborated with marvellous ingenuity. For instance, the Hindu hells or *Narakas* are one hundred and thirty-six. The walls of the principal of these are over a hundred miles in thickness, and their shine of fire is so fierce that they burst the eyes of those who look at them even from the distance of four hundred leagues. Yama, the Greek Pluto, the Christian Satan, is two hundred and forty miles high. The hairs of his body are like palm-trees. He punishes the damned by putting them in beds of boiling oil, sawing their bodies in two, pouring molten lead into their ears, pulling out their toenails and tongues, and a vast number of other varieties of torture. The mind, says Goldsmith with much truth, is ever ingenious in making its own distress.

The general conception of hell has for many a fascinating horror like that of a modern murder and the subsequent hanging which brings so rapturous a relish to our hot rolls at breakfast. It is an early sample of that remarkable human peculiarity which seems to delight in pain, that morbid tendency to self-torture which, not content with ills of the present, looks forward with quivering horror to other worse ills in the future. And the future beyond experience, if not beyond reason, offers an ample field to the fancy of the Heautontimorumenos. The unseen and the unknown have ever presented an attractive arena for the gymnastics of the imagination. But as the bee and the spider suck, we are told, honey and poison from the same flower, so we may extract pain or pleasure from our something beyond the grave. Generally, we prefer to extract pain. The Kaffirs, with only thirteen paradises, have more than double that number of hells.

The primitive Christians, says the sarcastic Gibbon, were animated neither by the love of pleasure nor by the love of action. They were alike careless of procuring private happiness to the individual, or any public benefit to the world. But, he concludes, 'it was not in this world that the primitive Christians were desirous of making themselves either agreeable or useful.' This passage, by the way, in an edition edited by Dean Milman, is curiously varied by the omission of the word 'not.' But

Gibbon is perhaps a little hard on the primitive Christians. At all events, their hell is probably both as agreeable and as useful as that of other creeds. Though, indeed, it shows less variety of fancy than that of the Hindus, it yet runs a very close race in the arena of agony with that of the Muslims, wherein the lightest punishment is to be shod with shoes of fire, the heat of which causes the skull of the unlucky wight who wears them to boil like a caldron.

The pagan hell of punishment expounded by Platonism was continued and intensified by Christianism. Plato's hell endured for one thousand years only. The hell of the Christians burns for ever and for ever.

The evils of mediæval life were transported into our creed. Buckle's 'barbarous fancies of a barbarous age,' the stings and fangs of noxious wild beasts, and the yet more noxious human contrivances for torture, the rack and the wheel—evils at which educated humanity shudders in horror—partly original and partly borrowed from the earlier Tartarus and Gehenna, harmonised well with the severities of a time of ignorance, of a period of extravagant punishments and of extravagant persecution. As Christmas succeeded the Saturnalia, so the Furies of the heathen hell became demons, Pluto or Pan Satan, Avernus the bottomless pit, and Phlegethon the lake of fire and brimstone. Moreover, to the Oriental conception of heat was added, as also in the Muslim hell, that of cold, the egregious bugbear of the Scandinavian Edda. Icy ponds were intermingled with meres of molten metal. In *Measure for Measure* Claudio complains to his sister Isabella, that most gentle of virgin nuns, of residence 'in thrilling regions of thick-ribbed ice,' and the bitter change of fierce extremes is insisted on in Milton, where the damned 'starve in ice their soft ethereal warmth,' and pine periods of time in fixed and frozen round. Considerable difference of opinion prevails in the matter of hell, as will hereafter be seen. Ben Jonson satirically expressed the vain disagreements of divines much perplexed thereabout by Lanthorne disputing with his puppet in a Bartholomew Fair. Men may as well expect a union in the poles of heaven, as any unity of conceit in the matter of hell.

The holy fathers have spoken of hell at great length. About its existence, its varied pains, its everlasting duration, its names and its place, there are many ponderous tomes of patristic opinion. Nothing, if we may rely upon common consent, ancient origin, and religious authority, is more certain than the existence of hell. It is proved alike by holy Scripture, the holy fathers, and pagan testimony. It was framed before sin was hatched. Its pains are divided into general and special. A winepress will, according to Jerome, be a general torture of the damned. The Benedictine monk Eadmer allots them fourteen miseries, seven of the body and seven of the soul. Mortals will be afflicted with both of these, and so be in a worse case than the devils themselves. If a man, says S. Stephanus Grandimontensis, were to see these miseries, he would not be able to stir a limb, and would die incontinently of sheer fright. The special pains of hell are servitude, weeping, gnashing of teeth, darkness, confusion, despair, war, horror, fear, weakness, the worm, the society of devils, and many more—every one of these supported by numerous authorities. Sinners will be punished after the degree of their sins. There is one fire only, but it will not hurt all alike. The peccant members will be principally punished. There are, according to some, many mansions in hell. Others deny this, and declare it to be one deep ample ditch. These maintain that, though there are degrees of torment, there are no degrees of place. The damned will be bound together like faggots. The punishment of usurers, according to Adam Scotus, is a too intimate acquaintance with boiling gold. The eternity of hell is demonstrated by holy Scripture, that is by the holy fathers. Radulphus Ardens, a name as happily expressive as that of the Rev. J. Furniss hereinafter mentioned in his sixteenth homily for the seventh Sunday after Trinity, proves it from the passage in Psalm xlix. 14 :—'Death shall feed on them.' It is not written he shall consume them. For, says Radulphus, just as an ox tears not up the grass by the root, but so devours it that every day he may devour more, so the wicked will be for ever tortured by death, and will not be annihilated, that they may for ever live and for ever die. They shall seek death, as John says in the Apocalypse (ix. 7), and shall not find it, and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them. They shall be afflicted by four kinds of evil—shame, fear, penitence, and pain. But their shame shall be without a covering, their fear without hope, their penitence without profit, and their pain without pity.

It has been proved over and over again by others besides Jerome and Tertullian that the fire of hell is a terrible reality ; that it is corporeal material ; that its constituents are probably sulphur and fluid pitch. The sulphur stinks. This is satisfactorily shown by quite a swarm of learned authorities. Infidel quibblings have been easily quashed. How can incorporeal spirits be burnt? Answer: By incorporeal fire. How can material bodies be burnt for ever? Answer: By the analogues of the asbestos and the salamander, or again by a certain salting antiseptic virtue, or again by an Omnipotent implanting in the fire of a certain force which burns but consumes not. The causes of its intense heat are manifold. There is the divine justice and the confined nature of the situation; there is also the antiperistasis of external cold. The fact of the intense heat is proved by the Cacodemon himself, who, though a liar, and the father of lies, may in this matter be considered a credible witness. At all events, he would rather lessen than exaggerate its force. Cæsarius, a Cistercian of Heisterbach, says that in a town called Enthenich in Bonn, a certain Walter when sick saw Satan, with a face like a monkey and goat's horns. Walter asked him about the fate of his late master, Count William of Juliers. 'You know,' replied the demon, 'the district between Wolkenburg and Drachenfels. In faith, I tell you, that if that district and those mountains were both made of iron and set in that place where the soul of your master now is, they would be molten *antequam supercilium superius inferiori jungi posset*—in a word, before you could wink.' The colour of hell fire is probably a lurid green, no light but rather darkness visible. There is cold in hell, but no water. It is not improbable that there are corporeal worms, in the sense of serpents, and immortal, of which some say they are as thick as the rushes on the floor. But this is a matter of subtle inquiry and abstruse; and God, as the Muslim says, is the most knowing. This rigid and early doctrine of hell, elaborated by the fathers with more of cold —or rather warm—barbarity than of artistic skill, is always honoured with a prominent place in religious revivals. It was reserved for the later church to add those finer touches of adscititious torment which it is so difficult to read without deploring the savage and yet refined ingenuity of the human fancy.

Forsooth a terrible thing is the mediæval hell. What is it? A bottomless pit where the damned are confined under darkness in everlasting chains, a furnace where their fire is not quenched, a place of wailing and gnashing of teeth where their worm dieth not, a Tartarean eternity of hunger and of tears of which one hour is more bitter than a century here of acutest agony. A land of all evil, of every variety of physical and moral suffering, a land of lasting night and of never-ending despair. A deep fiery prison of divine fury, full of cries compared with which the cries heard by mortal ears are mere music, of pain to which all earthly pain is pleasure, of a stench to which the stench of rottenness is jessamine and balm, and of remorse of which all remorse here is but a picture or a shadow. Every body of the damned, says Jeremy Taylor, is more loathsome and unsavoury than a million of dead dogs. One body, says St. Bonaventura, would infect the whole earth. Any human idea of hell is paradise compared with what is really hell. We cannot conceive it. Suppose a man set in midwinter in a deep dark subterraneous dungeon, without fire, or table, or bed. Once a day, says Drexel, who has supplied this illustration— once a day let a morsel of bread hard as a stone and green with mould, and an eggcup full of stinking water be lowered to him by a long rope. This state of misery would be a state of luxury to him who is in hell. The poor folk are closely packed in Satan's hall—the German square mile, it has been computed by an exact ecclesiastic, would contain 100,000,000,000 of the damned. They are jammed together like grapes in a press, like bricks in a furnace, like the salt sediment of fish pickle in a barrel, like wood in a pile, like coals in a brazier, like sheep in a slaughter-house.

And yet every one hates his neighbour, and would tear him, if he might, to pieces with his teeth. That noble passion, the queen of all the rest, the sun of life, has no being in hell. In hell there is no love. They would kill themselves, but they cannot. Theirs is a life in death, a death that cannot die. They have no solace from past, present, or future. Sleep never comes to them that comes to all. They feel not the season's difference, they have no almanack, no stars. There is no clock in hell. Bridaine represents a tortured being rising from his bed of appalling agony, and asking What is the time? And a dull voice out of the darkness answers Eternity!

There is no clock in hell. Only they hear the tick of the clock of conscience, for ever and for ever. The sick man, tossing through the whole night on his bed of pain, hears with satisfaction the striking of every long expected hour which proclaims the slow departure of the darkness; but at last, at last the twittering birds salute the dawn with song, little by little the sun rises from his daily sepulchre, his pain slackens, sleep creeps on, and in the morning the faces of friends filled with tender solicitude surround his bed. But nothing of all this exists in hell. There, in hell, is no sunrise, nor sleep, nor dew of dawn, nor tuneful song of birds. Nothing but devils, darkness, desolation, and despair.

Of the many curious hallucinations or impostures which have made such sad impressions on the feebler intelligences of the world's childhood, the visions of hell are not the least important. One of the earliest sheaves of an exceedingly plentiful harvest of visions, cataleptic or otherwise, gathered by monkish industry into the holy barn, is that of the Irish saint Fursy, or Fiercy (as Milman spells it), in the seventh century, handed down to us by the Venerable Bede. It is distinguished by a comparative simplicity of detail. A monk of the ninth century, one Wettin or Vettin, gives an edition of hell illustrated with considerable care and ability. Why, he asks, is Charlemagne thus terribly tormented?—the exact nature of this monarch's suffering cannot be here reproduced—why is a king who has done so much for the Church in this very distressing plight? The answer is that he was too fond of making love to the ladies. Passing over the personal experiences of those inspectors of hell, as they have been profanely called—of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, and Sainte Thérèse, and the Monk of Evesham—we come to the interesting vision of Vaukelin. Ordericus Vitalis tells of a worthy priest of Bonneval, named Gualchelmus, or Gualchelinus, or Vauquelin, or Walkelin, who saw, on the 1st of January, in the year 1091—the moon then being in her eighth day in the constellation of the Ram—a vision of departed and reprobate spirits. Among these an innumerable crowd of women rode on saddles enriched with red-hot nails. The wind lifted them from time to time a cubit, and then let them drop. Of these several were noble ladies of the priest's acquaintance. 'Assuredly,' said the priest, 'I behold the ghosts of the departed, but none will believe me without tangible proof.' He therefore mounted on a black horse, intending to take it home to convince his neighbours. But his foot touched a stirrup of red-hot iron, and the hand which held the bridle was frozen. A damned soul, tormented for his usuries, and for having taken a mill in mortgage for a debt, shows him a heavy bar of hot metal from that same mill, which he is condemned to carry in his mouth. The seer is afterwards told that the mass he sang on that day has saved him from destruction for his contemplated larceny of the horse. In most of these visions religious rather than virtuous deeds are rewarded, and the punishment of immorality is less by far than that of impiety. After beholding many more terrible sights which the ecclesiastical historian has minutely recorded, Walkelin falls seriously sick for a whole week. 'What I have written,' says Ordericus, 'I heard from his own mouth, with more which has escaped my memory. I have told it for the edification of my readers that the wicked may repent of their evil deeds.' In the next century we read the composition of Tundale, another Irishman, in the reign of Stephen. This piece is in the best style, and approaches a Divine Comedy in prose. One thing in his vision is particularly worthy of record: his soul, travelling through hell, asks the angel—its guardian in this perilous pass—how these tortures are consistent with the text 'The Lord is good, His mercy is everlasting' (Psalm c. 5). 'That text,' replies the angel, 'has deceived many;' and proceeds to explain the justice of boiling sinners and afterwards straining them through a cloth—a method of torture not devoid of a weird originality, but suggestive of a culinary operation with a colander which lessens somewhat the grandeur of the conception.

Matthew Paris, in his chronicle of the time of King Stephen, A.D. 1153, gives an account of a certain soldier called Hoenus or Owen, yet another Irishman—it is strange how Irishmen abound in these visions—who obtained leave of the king to visit his parents in Ireland. There, remembering his sins—especially in the invasion of ecclesiastical property—he resolved to enter the Purgatory of the blessed St. Patrick. This was a cave into which if one entered truly penitent, he should be purged of his sins and see the torments of the damned into the bargain. With the license of the local bishop, the soldier enters that cave. Investigators hitherto had entered hell in the spirit only; Owen enters it in the flesh, and discovers a vast twilight plain in which he is grievously assaulted by devils, but escapes them by the utterance of a sacred formula. In a second plain he sees persons of every age and of both sexes naked, with their bellies nailed to the ground by red-hot nails of iron, and all uttering a common *miserere!* Upon these wretched ones demons ran, whipping them as they went. Hoenus is again delivered by the repetition of what he had said before. In a third plain the people are lying on their backs, fixtures, with fiery dragons and flaming serpents and horrid toads banqueting upon the contents of their bowels. In a fourth penal plain the ill-starred damned hang suspended over flames of sulphur by iron hooks in their feet, eyes, hands, nostrils, ears, navels, and other parts of their anatomy. Several pages follow of other excruciating agonies, but the reader has probably by this time had enough of it. Like Macbeth, he has supped full of horrors, and direness grown familiar can no more start him. Besides, to adopt the phraseology used by one of these seers of visions, there would be an end to this article long before there was an end to the torments mentioned in these books and others like them. A hundred tongues, a hundred mouths, and an iron voice would fail to describe them all. They are, however, species of genera which have been skilfully summed up by one of the Schoolmen in two Latin hexameters :—

> Nix, nox, vox, lachrymæ, sulphur, laquei, sitis. æstus,
> Malleus, et stridor, spes perdita, vincula, vermes.

A neat mnemonic form, whereby to remember punishments of which, albeit they are spoken of, as Jeremy Taylor says, 'variously, uncertainly and unsatisfyingly,' it may be said, as indeed it has been said, that nobody can, without an express revelation, prove that they are not true.

The infernal punishments shown by Virgil to Dante, who descended into hell, like Hercules and Orpheus and Theseus and others, including those mentioned above, are in this age of educational progress familiar to misses who 'smell of bread and butter.' The following synopsis is merely intended to refresh the memory—so apt to languish—of the adult.

In the very entrance and gate of Dante's hell are placed the apathetic, the indifferent in spiritual things, a neutral society, while on earth, in the matter of religious good and evil, which now fills the air with sighs and lamentations, an air stained by solid darkness and unpierced by the light of any star. Then in the first circle or limbo the unbaptised, among whom is Virgil himself, desire without hope. In the second are carnal sinners tossed by warring winds where light is silent. In the third gluttons bitten by Cerberus are exposed in a stinking land to storms of hail. In the fourth are the prodigal and the miser, each pushing a heavy weight up a hill with his breast. In the fifth are the irascible under the foul and fetid slime of the Stygian lake. In the sixth arch-heretics smart and agonise in tombs of flame. In the seventh the violent swim in rivers of blood, suicides are changed into gnarled trees, and blasphemers writhe under a rain of fire. In the eighth, or *Malebolge*, are pimps scourged by demons, flatterers sunk in human ordure, simonists with their heads downwards in equal and circular holes, prophets with their faces reversed—both of these punishments are probably new and original—public peculators in a lake of boiling pitch, hypocrites under gilded hoods of lead, sacrilegists stung by serpents, schismatics, among whom is Muhammad, with maimed limbs, alchemists, forgers, and impostors, among them Ulysses, the hero of the Homeric poem, the victims of varied disease. In the ninth circle, which corresponds to the seventh or nethermost Muslim hell, *Al Hawiyah*, which, being interpreted, is the place of precipitous descent, the hell of hypocrites, the last, the worst, the frozen, traitors are fitly placed ; and among these, blue pinched, shrouded in ice, and chattering like storks, are to be found the most famous of that crafty crew, Lucifer and Judas.

Of this long catalogue of post-mortem ills, the credit is far from being entirely due to the fertile fancy of Alighieri. The punishments of which he has given such minutely detailed and graphic descriptions were not all invented by himself. He is indebted for most of them to the above-quoted visions. His funereal song is but a faithful echo of the passionate fanaticism and barbaric fierceness of the fourteenth century.

Suso, or St. Amandus, a Dominican professor of theology in the sixteenth century, in his *Der ewigen Weyssheit Büchlin*, in the chapter 'Von immerwerender Pein der Hellen,' has a touch of pathos followed by a conception of quaint originality :—

> Alas ! [thus the chorus of the damned goes up] alas for our woe and pain which must endure for ever ! Alas, oh, for ever and for ever ! what art thou ? Alas end without all end ! Alas death beyond all death ! To die every moment, and yet never to be able to die ! Alas father and mother ! and all we love ! God be gracious to you always, for we may never see you, never love you any more. We must be separated from you for ever. Alas separation ! Alas everlasting separation ! how full of fear art thou !
>
> . . . Alas ! we want nothing but a millstone, as broad as the whole earth, and so thick and high as to touch the Heaven on every side, and let a little bird come only once in a hundred thousand years, and take away from the stone a piece only so big as the tenth part of a millet grain, we poor wretches want nothing else save that, when this stone is at an end, our martyrdom may have an end also ; and yet that may never be !

Quevedo's hell in the sixth of his visions, written in 1608, goes by the appellation of

Las Zahurdas de Pluton, or *Pluto's Pigsties.* This is rather a satire on the follies and vices of his time than a deliberate attempt to portray the condition of the damned. Passing through a little door like a mousetrap, through which it was easy to get in, but impossible to get out, Quevedo beholds the devils busied in punishing with various pains the tradesmen who ruin their neighbours by selling them what is unnecessary at a high price, the poets who torment one another, the false wits who are confined by themselves lest their frigidity should extinguish the fires of hell, those who boast of their high birth and ancient descent, men of so-called honour, astrologers, hypocrites, and many others. Shelley's *Peter Bell the Third* is written in much the same vein.

In 1620 was published Decker's *Dream*, in which the volume of hell was opened to him, wherein he read many wonderful things. It bears the naive motto *Est Deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo.* Decker passes through hell's regions—

Being mounted on a spirit's back, which ran
With mandrake shrieks, and like a lubrican.

The lubrican adds a mysterious charm to the couplet. There is no remarkable originality in the *Dream.* It is the old, old story of agonies—

In boiling brimstone, lead, and oil, and blood.

Such, says the genial Dr. Johnson, is the malignity of Milton that hell grows darker at his frown. Let us see if this be so. We may well imagine that human fancy cannot add to the horrors we have already encountered. Milton's hell is situated at the bottom of Chaos. Its description is, in short, an antarctic region of fire and ice, of dire hail and ever-burning sulphur. Its distance from heaven is three semi-diameters of our mundane system. The stature of Satan reaches the sky. Four infernal rivers are introduced from the pagan theology. In this geographical view Lethe is also included. On the other side of the flood of oblivion is a frozen continent. Hither all the damned are haled by harpy-footed Furies from beds of fire to pine in ice. The gates of hell are guarded by Death and Sin, in forms too well known to need description. By these ideal architects a long bridge is built from hell to the 'utmost orbs of this frail world,' which, being interpreted by Masson is, the uttermost circle of the starry sphere. Milton's torments are more poetic, but less painful, we may suppose than those of the Christian fathers. Just. Georg Schottel, a contemporary of Milton, added to the literature of hell his *Iron Wheel* (*Eisernes Rad von der ewigen Höllenquaal*) in some 300 pages, and Meyfart his *Hellische Sodoma*, in about 800.

In 1715 appeared *Hell opened to Christians*, to caution them from entering it, a translation from the Italian of the Jesuit Pinamonti. This book contains considerations of the infernal pains distributed like Francatelli's bills of fare for every day in the week. The first consideration for Sunday treats of the prison of hell, its straitness, its darkness, its stench, and concludes with a prayer to avoid it. The book is illustrated with seven woodcuts of fantastic horror. The woodcut for Sunday shows a sinner in a cage fettered and in flames. He is pierced through with spears. Two monsters assail him, one above with the head of a panther, the body of a serpent, and the wings of a griffin, and one below of a similar composite form. Marks of their bites are plainly visible about him. This book, with its emblematic plates, passed through several editions. The last was printed in 1844. Successive artists have occasionally added to the original alarm. 'Do not,' says Pinamonti in his preface, 'suppose that I have exaggerated aught. I have indeed failed on the other side.'

The work of Pinamonti is fairly familiar from Lecky's reference to it. It cannot, however, compete in any way with a much less known volume, published in the first half of the seventeenth century, by Father Gio. Battista Manni, also an Italian Jesuit. The *Eternal Prison of Hell for the Hard-hearted Sinner* reached in 1692 its eleventh edition. It was translated into German in 1683 with additions. It possesses four times the number of illustrations in Pinamonti, and every picture is quadruply painful. Historical examples are added to every illustration. The book treats, in order, of the pains of the five senses, of darkness, wrath, despair, fire, immobility, eternity, and poisonous reptiles. It has a chapter on the multiplicity of torments, and on the want of room among the damned. Tyrants, misers, drunkards, blaphemers, and unchaste women have all their specially devised punishments. The conclusion of the whole matter is that absence of faith is the cause of hell. 'Dalle quali cose tutte chiaramente si comprende'—thus the author—'che la mancanza o la freddezza della fede sia la vera cagione di tutti ipeccati che sono nel mondo.' What a contrast these two volumes of the Italian Jesuits present to the innocent loving-kindness of that tender-hearted village priest who, observing his congregation affected to tears by a picture of the infernal punishments he had predicted from the pulpit as their possible fate, concluded his homily by this comfortable exhortation :—'Do not, my beloved brethren, I beseech you, be thus overburdened with distress. I have told you of these punishments, as they have been told to me, but, after all, I really cannot vouch for their truth.'

A Welsh view of hell was given in the beginning of the last century by Elis Wyn, a Welsh parson, in a prose allegory called *The Sleeping Bard.* The reverend gentleman is taken by an angel to hell in his sleep. There is nothing remarkable about this work, except the donation to the devil of a family of three daughters—Pleasure, Lucre, and Pride—and the introduction of a new demon, the demon of tobacco.

An original idea of hell was the result of the speculative inquiries of Jean Hardouin. This most learned fool, as he has been somewhat impolitely called by Peignot, among the Jesuits, was a contemporary of Pinamonti. He maintained that the rotation of the earth was due to the efforts of the damned to escape from their central fire. Climbing up the walls of hell, they caused the earth to revolve as a squirrel its cage, or a dog the spit.

From the description of hell by Jonathan Edwards, that sturdy theologian, one sentence will probably be found more than sufficient :—

> After you shall have worn out the age of the sun, moon, and stars in your dolorous groans and lamentations, without rest day and night, or one minute's ease, yet you shall have no hope of ever being delivered ; after you shall have worn out a thousand more such ages, you shall have no hope, but shall know that you are not one whit nearer to the end of your torments ; but that still there are the same groans, the same shrieks, the same doleful cries incessantly to be made by you. . . . Your bodies, which shall have been burning all this while in those glowing flames, shall not have been consumed, but will remain to roast through eternity.

But still, even according to this amiable ecclesiastic, the damned will have one satisfaction. It is an ill wind that blows nobody good, and theirs will be the unselfish consolation of reflecting that the sight of the hell torments which they suffer will exalt the happiness of the saints for ever ; for it will make them 'more sensible of it, it will give them a more lively relish of it.' Parents will see their children, children their parents, wives their husbands, and husbands their wives, in ineffable agony, and prize their own felicity the more—'a sense of the opposite misery in all cases greatly increases the relish of any joy.'

This is no new idea of Jonathan Edwards. In the third part of the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, the great schoolman, the friend of Bonaventura, in the ninety-fourth supplementary question, it is concluded in three articles—first, that since contraries set each other in relief, the blessed in the kingdom of heaven will see the tortures of the damned, that their own blessedness may the more delight them ; secondly, that since the damned cannot be transferred from their misery, the blessed will have no compassion upon them ; and, lastly, that the holy ones in heaven will not rejoice in the pains of the damned *per se,* but *per accidens,* since they contemplate therein the divine justice and their own freedom therefrom. Thus the Seraphic Doctor. And Tertullian, in his *De Spectaculis,* anticipates with frank delight the torments of his ethnic opponents. 'Ah ! the broad magnificence of that scene ! How shall I laugh and be glad and exult when I see these wise philosophers, who teach that the Gods are indifferent and men soulless, roasting and browning before their own disciples in hell. Then shall I hear these dramatists declaim in tragedies of their own passion, then shall I see these actors become yet more supple in the fire. Then will this chariot-driver appear one red with his flaming chariot,' with other considerations of the same kidney. 'Tantæne animis cælestibus iræ !'

The *Eloge de l'Enfer,* attributed to one Bénard, or Bernard, but probably written by the Abbé Quesnel, is, like Quevedo's *Pigsties,* merely a picture of humanity and a satire on the foolish fashions of the time. The reader must be sick and tired, says the author, of the numerous descriptions of hell torments. He therefore proposes, for a change, to write in praise of hell. It is a strange subject perhaps of praise, but the learned Erasmus has written in praise of folly, and the elegant Lucian in praise of a fly. The nature of the work is shown by its commencement. All good things are placed in the middle. The mean is golden. The kernel is in the centre of the fruit. Jerusalem is in the centre of the habitable globe. The sun is in the centre of our cosmic system. Hell is in the centre of the earth. The broad way is easier than the strait. Philosophers, politicians, poets, historians, artists, mathematicians, the bravest men, the fairest women, the best society, we find them all in hell.

Chateaubriand, in *Les Martyrs,* gives a more modern and less horrible idea of hell than has yet been presented to the reader. The pain in *Les Martyrs* endured by the damned is rather moral than physical, and no minute detail of torture is attempted. The book is big with pretty passages. Satan is dragged down to hell by the weight of his own wickedness. Though the king of that dismal domain, he himself is appalled by its lugubrious sounds. Death, a skeleton, appears like a black stain upon the flames which burn and leap behind her. The livid rays of infernal light pass through the hollows of her bones. Satan mocks the cries of the poor—placed in hell by Chateaubriand probably for the first time—calling them the enemies of all exalted above them by education or by morals. In the centre of the abyss of hell, in the midst of an ocean of blood and tears, a black castle stands, beaten by eternal storms. This is Satan's home. A barren tree is before its door, and on its windy summit waves the fallen archangel's standard of pride half consumed by the divine lightning.

In Pollok's *Course of Time*, published in the first quarter of the present century, we have several graphic and interesting pictures; notably of the wall of fiery adamant so high that Hope cannot fly over it, of the sad figures traced in fire, of the worm that never dies feeding upon a quivering heart—pictures described, without much pretence to originality, but with considerable unction, in blank verse.

The *Breve fra Helvede*, written by V. A. Thisted, under the pseudonym of M. Rowel, published in 1866 at Copenhagen, present consciousness and memory as hell's only torments. Thisted, both in his sobriety and in his satire, reminds the reader of Quevedo. Not inferior to the best pictures of the Spanish wit are those of Pilate ever washing his hands, like Lady Macbeth, to efface the stain of blood, and ever asking, 'What is truth?' Of Judas, with a noose about his neck, and thirty pieces of silver burning his palm, which return to him as often as he casts them away, while he repeats incessantly, 'What is that to us? see thou to that!' Of the servant of the high priest with shrivelled fingers crying again and again, 'Why smotest thou me?' Curious things are told us, too, in this book. Hell has its churches, and its sensational preachers, but there are no children in hell. It has its theatres, balls, novels, and finally its post-office, of which the peculiarity is that there the applicant is compelled to receive the letters he himself has written, and all his scandal-disseminating, anonymous lying epistles burn holes in his compulsorily outstretched hand.

Passing over the contributions of Swedenborg and Blake, the reader arrives at a recently published tract, *The Sight of Hell*, written for children by the Rev. J. Furniss. This gives a detailed description of many terrible tortures. A girl of sixteen stands with bare feet upon a red-hot floor. A boy with flames issuing from his ears is immersed up to his neck in a boiling kettle. A little child utters shrieks of agony in a burning oven. Matthew Horbery's *Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the duration of Future Punishment*—a work bristling with sacred texts and originally written against Whiston in 1744—was republished not more than a dozen years ago. And there is more than one edition in the present century, besides a Dutch translation in 1860, of the *Sighs from Hell; or Groans of a Damned Soul*, an unfamiliar sample of the familiar eloquence of Bunyan. A curious entry in the bibliography of this subject. that of Henri Johanet's *Descente aux Enfers*—which is merely a topographic study of the Bay of Naples and its vicinity—recalls Gosse's *On Viol and Flute*, which has been referred to as a treatise on musical instruments.

There is no space in the present article to do more than allude to the representation of hell in the mystery plays, and in church sculpture. On either of these topics an essay might be written. The sermons upon hell of such saints as Bonaventura and Dominic, preached at midnight, with a sudden and dramatic extinguishment of candles, are in their way as interesting and effective as the numerous pictures of hell by the ancient artists. For the painters of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Dante was the general guide. Sandro Botticelli's engravings illustrate every circumstance of the *Divine Comedy*. Fra Angelico da Fiesole has not succeeded in making his demons terrible, but *en revanche* he has made them fat. The Orcagnas, both Bernard and Andrea, Jacques Callot and Peter Breughel the younger, have contributed largely to the infernal Nigaristan. Peter, indeed, was called Hell Breughel. Michael Angelo's Last Judgment, with its pagan bark of Charon and its revenge on Biagio, is of course well known.

The place of hell has given rise to very wide divergence of theological doctrine. It is the darkened air of Chaos, it is the waters above the firmament, it is the valley of Jehoshaphat, it is the poles, it is the antipodes, it is Mars, it is, as Plutarch also opined, the moon. It is clearly not any burning mountain, such as Hecla, Ætna, or Vesuvius, as some fatuous folk have maintained, because these mountains are not for ever vomiting fire. The general, and perhaps the orthodox, opinion—this assertion is made with considerable doubt—places hell in the earth's centre. Such appears to be the conviction of Tertullian and others, borrowed perhaps from Plato's *Phædo;* Jeremy Drexel, writing in 1680, deduces it from the history of Korah. Objections were very soon started to this belief, such as the absence of air, the presence of water, the combustion of the earth, and the insufficiency of room. Then rose up one Tobias Swinden, M.A., a rector of Cuxton in Kent, and published in 1797 a book well stuffed with recondite erudition, showing that the local hell is, in all probability, the sun. The spots upon that fiery orb are possibly clotted companies of damned souls.

The idea of locating hell in the sun was promulgated more than a century before the time of Swinden by Sandys in his *Travels,* but he speaks of the Muslim and not of the Christian Tartarus. The religious tenets entertained by the Mahommedans—who have by the way an especial hell for Christians, the third of the seven, called *Hutamah,* which, being interpreted, is the place of breaking—exceed, according to Sandys, the vanity of dreams and all old wives' fables. For they declare that Cain will be the ringleader of the damned; that the burning globe of the sun will be their continent; and that the Devil or Iblis will be ultimately annihilated.

About the shape of hell another question arises. Is it oblong, square, circular, or pyramidal? It is probably circular, but its area is uncertain.

In the matter of hell's inhabitants, also, declarations greatly differ. When Elizabeth died and James the First came in, an Irish priest thus expressed it:—'Elizabetha in Orcum detrusa, successit Jacobus alter hæreticus.' 'You will ask,' says Selden, who relates this story, 'why did they use such language in their Church? Answer: Why does the nurse tell the child of Rawhead and Bloody-bones? To keep it in awe!' Mediæval ecclesiastics commonly placed in hell their enemies and opponents. Still we commonly say a judgment falls upon a man for something in him we cannot abide. Much more than two thirds of the human race must necessarily be turned into hell, according to those who set therein all the heathen. By numerous authors, the wisest and best men of antiquity—Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Trajan, and Epictetus—the most moral and religious votaries of alien creeds are confounded in the penal pit with the most execrable of mankind. Dr. Emmons, an American clergyman of repute, in the earlier half of the present century, in a remarkably impartial sermon *On the Hopeless State of the Heathen,* damns atheists, deists, heretics and heathen alike. The future state of man, it seems to some, depends upon his views of predestination. Dr. Prideaux told his auditory they are damned who do not believe in this, and in original sin and in other matters of a similar nature. Very few in this business are so liberal as Luther, who spoke of Cicero as 'ein weiser und fleissiger Mann; ich hoffe unser lieber Gott werde ihm und seines gleichen gnädig sein.'

The most interesting book on the future state of the heathen was written by Francis Collio, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, *De animabus Paganorum libri quinque.* This work, which is full of learned arguments and quotations, contains some 900 pages. Its reach extends from Melchisedec to Tertullian, and it embraces Orpheus, Homer, the Seven Wise Men, the Sibyls, the Magi, Apollonius Tyaneus, and many more. About the souls of the Queen of Sheba and Hermes Trismegistus Collio declines to express an opinion. He supposes that the friends of Job, the midwives Sephora and Phua, Melchisedec and Solomon, are exulting in the beatitude of the blest, but that Balaam, Nebuchadnezzar and Tertullian are irrecoverably damned. In this list of the lost Origen is commonly included. Etienne Binet, who wrote a whole book about Origen's future state, puts the matter, like Cornellius in his *Exactissima infantium in limbo clausorum querela &c.,* in a legal form. The judge defers his opinion *sine die,* but Binet thinks that the evidence, on the whole, is in favour of the Saint's acquittal. Others besides Origen have had books devoted solely to a consideration of their condition after death. Among them are Pythagoras, Seneca, and Thomas à Becket. Swedenborg is said to have set David and Paul among the damned, but made George the Second and Louis the Fourteenth into angels. The Rev. R. W. Dibdin, M.A., minister of the West Street Episcopal Chapel, St. Giles, thinks, in a sermon entitled *The Patriot Palmerston, was he saved?* that the Lord may have had mercy on him though at the eleventh hour.

Of devils, Gulielmus Parisiensis has found on an exact computation that there are 44,435,556, but it has been said that they vastly exceed that number. Their external forms and internal characteristics have been minutely described. Their bodies are not terrestrial, but, according to the Church scholastics, something analogous. John Wier, a physician of Clèves, convinced that this world is peopled by crowds of devils, wrote in 1576 a book of some thousand folio pages, which is one of our chief sources of information on the subject. He makes 72 princes of devils, with 7,405,926 subjects. He may have owed this information to his master, Cornelius Agrippa. Collin de Plancy, in his *Dictionnaire Infernal,* has given pictorial illustrations to supplement Wier. The figure of a devil, generically, is that of a goat with two horns in front and two behind ; but he also appears as a frog, a fly, a donkey, and a spider. Blake saw him as a swimming spider. He assumes, shortly, every shape except that of a dove and of a lamb. By Europeans he is commonly painted black. The Africans prefer a white devil. That old serpent Satan, the supreme Prince of this world, of the powers of the air, and of darkness, Lucifer *the* devil *par excellence,* is described as a great red dragon with seven crowned heads, ten horns, and a huge tail. He has two deputies, one of the seà, having three crowns more than his master, displayed with the body of a leopard, the feet of a bear, and the tail of a lion ; the other of the earth, known as the beast, with two horns only. Lucifer, who spoke with Eve, being bound in Tartarus, is, according to some authorities, not busied with this world, and Beelzebub is his lieutenant here. The demons are divided into hierarchies, and one is preferred before another. There is, moreover, a division of demons into those of air, who are concerned with storms and lightning, those of earth, who bring sickness and death, and those of water, who busy themselves about wrecks. Some of the most important demons are named by the pupil of Cornelius Agrippa : Sytry, Nibhas, Morax, Nisroch, Otis, Pruflas, Oray, Tartac, Valefar, and Chax. Chax, or Scox, is described as like a stork, with a thin hoarse voice. He can take away the sight and the hearing. He can also take away (from their right owners) money and horses. He is addicted to lying, save when he is introduced into a triangle, when he will immediately speak of hidden treasures. He rules over thirty legions of devils.

As to the number of the damned there is also dissent. Some, as Cælius Secundus Curio, in his *Amplitude of the Heavenly Realm,* suppose that the number of the saved will be much greater. Prudentius, a Christian poet of the fourth century, opined that a few only would be damned—

paucosque non piorum
Patitur perire in ævum.

Others think the number will be much less ; and others, again, that it will be equal. But Dr. Lewis du Moulin, a professor of history at Oxford in 1680, proved from Scripture and other evidence, to his own satisfaction plainly and conclusively, in his *Moral Reflections upon the Number of the Elect,* that not one in a hundred thousand (nay, probably, not one in a million), from Adam down to our times, shall be saved. And the Professor is certainly in the right of it, if, as we are told, all liars will be damned. Modern opinion on this subject seems to side with Curio. As all idiots and children between seven and twelve will undoubtedly go to heaven, the proportion of the damned to the saved will be as that of the inhabitants of prisons and penitentiaries to the whole population.

It is a vain thing, says the author of the *Uxor Hebraica,* to talk of a heretic, for a man can think no otherwise than he does think. Opinion, whereof neither gods nor brutes partake, has made all the confusion in the world. Yet will men continue to disseminate opinions, and to talk of heresies, and many are those which have from time to time arisen about hell. They will be touched as lightly as possible, for here one walks ‘ per ignes suppositos cineri doloso.’

About the eternity of punishment there has been lately quite a little epidemic of controversy. But this is, in truth, a very old matter of religious debate. St. Augustin wrote a whole book on the subject. The lively discussions and discordant speculations which buzz about our ears buzzed with a near similarity of sound from the mouths of Epicureans and Peripatetics, Platonists and Origenists, lewd Pagans and carnal Christians, about the ears of the early Fathers of the Church. Nothing was satisfactorily determined then. Nothing is satisfactorily determined now. Yet it is an article of faith with a large section of Christian people. Both the Jew and the Muslim, however bad, are saved from everlasting torment. But eternal damnation for the Christian is a cardinal tenet of orthodoxy. This burning question is like the shirt of Nessus. It is difficult for many people to tear it from them. In vain may Mr. Morley speak of it as the most frightful idea that ever corroded human character. In vain Herbert Spencer includes it among beliefs destined to die out. In vain is the observation of Oliver Wendell Holmes that all reasoning, all texts, cannot reconcile the supposition of a world of sleepless torment with the declaration that God is love. Unbelief, pathetically laments Carlyle, has got so far that it would be some comfort even if we could believe in a devil. The philosopher takes too desponding a view of the situation. Not only do most of us believe in a devil, but in eternal damnation to boot.

The mixed constitution of the human mind is curiously shown by the fact that the same saint who wrote a book supporting eternal pains was also the author of some observations touching the purpose of the creation of hell, otherwise too naughty to be quoted. 'I reply,' says St. Augustin, 'to him who inquires what the divinity did before he made heaven and earth—not, indeed, that which one is reported to have replied in a jocular fashion in order to avoid the question—he prepared Gehenna for such as are for investigating mysteries. No! I would reply that I know not what I do not know, rather than put off the matter in a manner which might cover an earnest inquirer with mockery, though the respondent might obtain the praise of a witty fellow.' The Saint afterwards says boldly that before the divinity created heaven and earth, he did—nothing. The jocular story of St. Augustin recalls the negro preacher who, in explaining the creation, showed how Adam was made out of clay, and then set to dry against a post. But, said a sceptic of the congregation, 'if Adam was first man, who fixed dat ere post?' 'Dry up dere, nigger,' replied the preacher; 'anoder of dem questions 'll bust up dis whole meeting.'

Prudentius has in some of his hymns given vent to the heterodox opinion that the damned have an annual holiday. They repose, he sings, on the day of the resurrection:—

> Marcent suppliciis Tartara mitibus
> Exsultatque sui carceris otio
> Umbrarum populus liber ab ignibus:
> Nec fervent solito flumina sulphure.

Of this matter Jeremy Taylor has taken notice. It is, according to him, an idle fancy to suppose that when the paschal taper burns, the flames of hell cannot burn until the holy wax is spent, and he assures us that the evil portion of the damned shall be continued without intermission of evil.

After the form of excommunication writ by Ernulphus had been read by Dr. Slop in *Tristram Shandy*, 'I declare,' quoth my uncle Toby, 'my heart would not let me curse the devil himself with so much bitterness.' And when Dr. Slop replied, 'He is cursed and damned already to all eternity,' 'I am sorry for it,' quoth my uncle Toby. 'Too merciful,' says Dr. Rusca, an eminent Italian theologian who presented the world in 1621 with a volume of some 600 pages on the subject of hell—'too merciful are many and insanely mild and compassionate in the matter of devils. They will have us suppose that at some time, after many myriads of years indeed, yet still at some time, they may return to happiness and to heaven.' John Tritheim, in his *Chronicle of the Benedictine Abbey of Hirsau of Würtemberg*, speaks of a yet more terrible heresy in 1315—forsooth, that both Lucifer and his demons would be eventually restored to beatitude, but that St. Michael and all angels would be deputed for eternal torment. The final restoration of the devil has been supported by the authority of Origen and his less known pupil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Ambrose and Jerome, according to some; but others deny this support, and declare in the case of Origen that his pages have been adulterated by heretical subterfuge and deceit. This particular heresy bears in the religious phraseology of the present the title of Restorationism. It was maintained by Oliver Cromwell's chaplain, Jeremy White, who, in the interval of making love to his master's daughter, wrote a book *On the Restoration of all Things, or the Recovery of the whole Creation out of their Fall.* The opinion of the modern Annihilationists, among whom is to be numbered John Locke, appears to have been sustained by Arnobius and by Irenæus. They supposed the damned would be annihilated by the fire which is with them the sybmol of destruction, but not of suffering. The Universalists, whose views approach very closely those of the Restorationists, who seem to deny the existence of hell, and say that all will be ultimately saved, date from the beginning of Christian history. A celebrated modern exponent of these views, Hosea Ballou of Boston, was also a Unitarian. The famous Archbishop Tillotson informed his audience that the threatened pains of hell might be remitted. Of course the Bible is quoted in confirmation of all these heresies by their supporters, as it is quoted in defence of every variety of religious creed; the Bible—whereby, as Selden says, if they would speak clearly, they mean themselves, but they are ashamed to say so.

Origen holds the heresy of a metaphorical fire in direct opposition to the Schoolmen who, describing hell's pains as positive and negative, tell us that the former, those of sense, are literally indicated by the fire, and the latter, those of loss, metaphorically by the worm. Origen, in his *De Principiis*, says, the fire of hell is kindled by the sinner himself and not by another. That the fuel of this fire is sin. That outer darkness is nought save ignorance. That the sinner has, as it were, some seeds of sin left in his soul from which arises a whole harvest of ills. The contemplation of these ills is his punishment. This is the fire which is profitable for the soul's cleansing. It is an emendatory fire. The *raison d'être* of hell is not condemnation, but correction. Origen, in a word, substituted purgatory for hell. John Scotus Erigena followed his example in the ninth century, and Bossuet, in his sermon on the Glory of God, says, 'L'Enfer, si nous entendons, c'est le péché lui-même.' The Christian homilist is dangerously near the pagan philosopher Lucretius, who says, 'in vita sunt omnia nobis.' And they both approach in this respect the unbelieving Sadducee. Hell has also been supposed to be a living animal, as, according to Origen, was the earth; conscience, passion, the body, death and a naughty life. The last view was that of Philo and of Jean-Jacques. It is very near that of Swedenborg, who found the fire of hell in the love of self and of the world. Why, asked Rousseau, are we to look for hell in another life? But these are idle interpretations. There is, indeed, no orthodox doubt that the fire is material.

A common opinion divides hell into four parts—the lowest part is for demons, for the souls of the damned, and for their bodies after the resurrection; the next is purgatory, where the same fire burns, but differs in duration; the next is the limbo of unbaptised infants, and the next or highest, that of the fathers or just men dead before the season of redemption, called Abraham's bosom. The third of these partitions of hell will be thickly populated. It has been said that, including embryos, two-thirds of the human race perish as infants unbaptised. If this be so, the 'domus exilis Plutonia' of Horace must by this time be fairly full.

The damnation of unbaptised babies has afforded, from the days of St. Augustin, the 'durus pater infantum' in the fourth century, a wide arena for the tactics and evolutions of the Evangelical militia. A certain priest has condemned the doctrine of their salvation in terms to which an auditor unfamiliar with polemical theology might object as unbefitting a humane man, not to speak of a servant of God. This monster of atheism, he says, referring to that doctrine, has little by little grown like a venomous serpent, and has by its slimy convolutions wound its way into our midst. Michael Wigglesworth, in his *Day of Doom*, written in what its author probably supposed was poetry, introduces the reprobate infants complaining of their punishment for Adam's sin, but, replies the divine arbiter, 'you may with reason share in his treason . . . yet unto you I shall allow the easiest room in hell.' How deeply theology has dived into this question may be seen by consulting Walch (J. G.), *De Fide in Utero*. The prevalent persuasion seems to be that infants, being stained with original sin, are the predestinated prey of demons. It has been said indeed that hell is paved with skulls of infants not a span long, that the soul of an unbaptised baby flits over marshes in winter nights in the form of an *ignis fatuus*—and that the bosom of the robin was burned in the penal fire while he carried a drop of water in his charity to a child in hell. How, it is asked, if belief and good works be essential to salvation, can infants be saved? and, again, if children be totally depraved, is it true that of such is the kingdom of heaven? The *Exactissima infantium &c.* of Cornellius, published at Paris in 1531, now exceedingly rare, gives a fanciful report of a case on this matter, a case reported with all the formalities of civil and canon law. First comes the declaration of infants in limbo against divine judgment. Then the plea of the defendant, then the replication of the plaintiffs, and then the decision of the judge. Though the decision is against the plaintiffs, Garasse was so shocked at their replication, that he calls the author of the case a miserable abortion, and thanks God that even the publisher was reduced to poverty for having printed so impious a book.

Finally, what have the sceptics, the freethinkers, to say on this subject of hell? Like the poor, they are always with us, and their surmises, though inaccurate and illusory, must be allowed to adulterate the pages of the present, as they stained from the earliest period those of the past. They say, with Madame Guyon, that pure love and not pure hate is the only everlasting fire. That though they are provoked to mirth by the absurdity of hell, they are also provoked to wrath by its cruelty. That the good should be loved and the bad should be hated for itself, and not from hope of reward in heaven or fear of punishment in hell. That endless punishment is not credible, being out of all proportion to crime. That the clergy would have us believe in it against the voices of our heads and hearts. As the good woman said to her husband, ‘What, will you believe your own eyes before your own sweet wife?’ That the infliction of it is not overcoming evil with good. That it would not benefit, to use a human figure of speech, the deity as inflictor, nor the saints as spectators, nor the damned as sufferers. That it is hardly good tidings of great joy. That, if it be the proper wages of sin, the sinner could never receive payment in full.

They allow, however, that it forms a grand motive for missionary effort. They allow that all wisdom and knowledge, all improvements in art, science, commerce, and literature are worse than vain; that, in fact, it is the chief and bounden duty of us all to become disseminators at once of this one idea—if it be true. But at the same time they think it likely to produce a bad example. They quote Queen Mary's justification of her human bonfires by the argument that since the souls of heretics were to burn eternally hereafter in hell, there could be nothing more proper for her than to imitate the divine vengeance on a small scale by burning as many of their bodies as she was able here on earth. And she burnt them with green wood out of pure kindness, in order to give them more time to repent. Besides this, they say that the orthodox should have no children, knowing the ultimate fate, according to all probability, in store for them. Then they ask —and ‘dimidium sapientiæ,’ says Bacon, ‘prudens interrogatio’—why should the devil persecute his own friends? If a deity made an endless hell, was it included in the works which he saw were very good?

They say the orthodox doctrine of hell is a traditional abstraction and refuse to regard it as an evangel. That it is intellectually inconceivable and morally dangerous. That it is alike incredible to the mind and intolerable to the heart. They say it is the outcome of human cruelty and revenge and wrong, and not of divine mercy, charity, and justice. That it is one of the results of the evil influence of priestly ambition and hierarchic greed upon the sad docility of ignorance and superstition. That it is of the milk of human kindness turned sour. That it is wholly inconsistent with the gentle and tolerant character of Christianity's founder, with the pitying love of that great arbiter who said to the adulteress, ‘Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more.’ That it debases the character of man and is a blaphemous representation of that of God. That not even a Nero or a Phalaris could look with complacency upon millions in eternal anguish on account of some ancestral crime or some metaphysical mistake. That the sweet love of him whose tender mercies are over all his works is not to be discovered in burning coals. That, if it be true that God is a father, nay the best of fathers, hell is a moral impossibility. That it makes men callous or drives them mad. That it paralyses the best, the emotional part of humanity. That it destroys the possibility of happiness for those in heaven and for those on earth.

They say that hell is not made for the rich and the powerful, but for the poor and the weak. That it condemns too often the innocent and acquits the guilty. That it is like the spider's web which ensnares the harmless little fly, but lets the hornet and the wasp go free. They quote Colonel Ingersoll's fable of the animals' conclave, in which they sought out the guilty one when they were stricken with a plague. ‘I of course am blameless,’ said the lion. ‘If any one denies it let him step forward.’ ‘I,’ said the fox, ‘have obtained absolution for the slaughter of the fowl;’ and ‘I,’ said the wolf, ‘have attacked the shepherd solely to obtain deliverance for the sheep.’ Said the poor donkey, ‘It is I who am the naughty one. *Mea culpa; peccavi.* Once in a fit of hunger I ate two thistles in a field belonging to a company of monks who were engaged at mass.’ In less than a minute they had that donkey's hide on the fence.

Finally, they say with Selden, ‘If the physician sees you eat anything that is not good for your body, he cries “’tis poison;” if the Divine sees you do anything hurtful for your soul. He cries, “You are damned.”’ To preach long, loud, and damnation is the way to be cried up. We love a man that damns us. If a man had a sore leg and an honest chirurgeon should only bid him keep it warm, he would not much regard him. But if a surgeon should say ‘Your leg will gangrene; it must be cut off, and you will die unless you do something I will tell you,’ what listening there would be to this man!

THE FOUNDER OF A PECULIAR SECT.

BY MISS EDITH SELLERS.

From *The Newbery House Magazine* (London), November, 1891.

About half a mile from the village of Charlinch, in drowsy, easy-going Somerset, is a huge building, which no traveller ever passes by unnoticed. There is something odd in its appearance, what it would be hard to say, unless it be that the walls are just a trifle stronger and the doors more securely barred than is the custom. The house has no special beauty of form to boast of, for it was built some fifty years ago, a time when architectural skill was at a low ebb amongst us ; but it has a substantial, comfortable air, which is not without its charm. It is the head-quarters of a religious community, a community which holds firmly to the faith of the old monks of Rievaulx, that spiritual fervour is best promoted by luxurious surroundings. Exquisite stained-glass windows, beautiful paintings, delicately wrought pieces of sculpture, soft carpets, rich curtains, all sorts of subtle combinations of gorgeous colours, give ample proof of the taste, as well as the affluence, of those who dwell there.

The head of this community is the Rev. Henry James Prince, one of the most remarkable personalities of this century. He is an old man now, with delicately cut features, kindly winning manners, and an air of innate refinement. There are no signs of great intellectual strength in his face, but his firmly set lips indicate indomitable resolution, and his eyes have a strangely weird fascination of their own ; they are large and beautifully formed, but they have, as it were, a veil drawn before them, so dreamy and absent is their usual expression. Yet, sometimes, just for a moment, they flash with an almost unearthly brightness, and are as keen and piercing as the eyes of a man in the prime of life and vigour. So intense is the restful peace of his face, that his very presence has a soothing effect upon the nerves of those around him ; trouble, perplexity, or doubt seem never to approach him, for, as far as man can judge, his faith —a faith such as surely no thinking being ever held before—is perfect, immovable. This is the man whom Bishops have denounced, whom judges have railed against, whom the greatest lawyers in the land have attacked with all the passionate vehemence of their craft ; his name has been bandied to and fro with execration in mass-meetings, where husbands and wives, mothers and fathers, have filled eager ears with tragic tales of the woe he has wrought to them and theirs.

Henry James Prince was born in Bath in 1811. Whilst he was still a child, his father, a man of good position, died, leaving his family but slenderly provided for. Mrs. Prince seems to have had considerable force of character ; for, immediately upon her husband's death, realising the impossibility of educating her children upon the income she possessed, she set to work to see how she could increase it. After several fruitless attempts to do so, she met with a Miss Martha Freeman, the daughter of a West Indian planter, and agreed to receive her into her house as a boarder. This was a most happy arrangement for the Princes. Miss Freeman soon became as devoted to the children as their own mother, and her little fortune proved a welcome addition to the family fund. From the first she attached herself especially to Henry, the youngest of the boys, a delicate little fellow, with large dark eyes which easily filled with tears, and a complexion which flushed and paled with every passing emotion. He was morbid and unchildlike, even in those days, finding far more delight in religious poetry than in the noisy games of his brothers and sisters. When he was sixteen, it was decided that he should be a doctor ; he therefore went, as was then the fashion, to an apothecary's to pick up what knowledge of medicine he could. Two years later, he was sent to London to go through the usual medical course at Guy's Hospital. His life in town was not a happy one ; having always lived with his mother, he had been carefully guarded from evil, so that the sayings and doings of some of his fellow-students came upon him as a positive shock ; their coarseness being as repulsive to his taste, as their immorality was to his religious sentiment. He shrank from any intercourse with them for some time, then his undoubted ability and the gentle courtesy of his manner won friends for him amongst the better class of his companions ; and, before he left, the worst of them were beginning to show signs of grudging admiration for " the young fanatic," as they called him. Strange to say, they were rather proud of the absolute blamelessness of his conduct, as if it were a credit to them personally ; and they treated him much as they would have treated a pretty younger sister, always suppressing the coarsest of their stories and the most unseemly of their jokes in his presence. In 1832 he took his medical diploma, and was at once appointed house-surgeon to the Bath hospital. He held this office for three years, during which time he gained the enthusiastic devotion of his patients, who were wont to declare that there never was a doctor at once so skilful, so firm, and yet so tender. He was then attacked by a terrible illness, and underwent a trying operation, which, although successful, left him in so feeble a condition that for months he lingered on the brink of the grave. This was in 1835, the very year he began to write his journal, the strangest combination of humility and presumption, spiritual ecstasy and sensual debasement, it ever entered the mind of man to conceive.

There is no reason to doubt the absolute sincerity of this journal. It is the history of a man's soul in its struggle for light, for peace; the outpouring of a sensitive, overwrought nature, one for which the unknown, the unknowable, has infinite charms. One passage in the journal was written as early as May 1834. "In the afternoon, at half-past four, having suffered under conviction of sin fifteen months, and during the last month with the utmost agony, it pleased God, of His infinite mercy, to reveal His Son Jesus Christ to me, by faith, whilst I was in earnest prayer." The next is July 1835: "About fifteen months ago I began a journal . . . but was obliged to bring it to a close, because it tended strongly to feed that spirit of self-righteousness which is one of my besetting sins." He describes himself as "one hour rejoicing with joy unspeakable and full of glory, the next trembling as it were at the very gates of hell." . . . "Oh for that eternity when my whole soul shall be a flame of love." "The enemy has come in 'like a flood'; and if the Lord had not put him to flight I know not what would have become of me. . . . My tears and prayers are polluted through and through. . . . I have no love for God, or zeal for His glory."

There is no doubt but that Miss Freeman's influence on Mr. Prince at this critical time was most pernicious; just when the restraining hand of masculine commonsense was most necessary for his morbidly excited state, he was shut up for days together with an emotional woman, who listened to his ravings as if they were the inspired utterances of a holy messenger. It is difficult to understand the relation between these two; he was only twenty-four at this time, and she was twice his age; yet, old enough to be his mother though she was, he loved her passionately, called her "God's own peculiar gift, and a very precious one," and habitually addressed her in the most glowing terms of endearment. They devoted the long weary hours of convalescence to an earnest study of the Scriptures, or rather of the more imaginative and emotional of them, the Song of Solomon being the book that appealed to them most strongly. The result of this was that Mr. Prince resolved to renounce medicine for divinity—was not the soul more precious than the body? He entered, therefore, S. David's College, Lampeter, as a theological student, Miss Freeman supplying part of the money for his training.

He went to Lampeter full of enthusiasm, with the most exalted notions as to the dignity of the priesthood, and the perfect holiness required of those who were prepared to take upon themselves its duties. Thrilled as he was at the thought of his own high vocation, he fully expected to find all his fellow-students animated by like sentiments to his own, and the awakening was rude when he discovered that the majority of them were but one remove better than his old companions at Guy's. The head of the college, too, fell sadly short of his ideal; he had pictured him as something between a S. Jerome and a Jewish Rabbi, and he found him a worthy gentleman, with polished manners, and rather worldly views upon things in general. Under the circumstances, for a man of Henry Prince's disposition, there were but two courses open—he must either leave the college at once, or try to reform it. After much heart-searching and questioning of the Divine Will, he resolved to stay. "May the Lord open a door for us here," he wrote in his diary; "at present it is truly the darkness of the 'shadow of death'; a land 'not sown.'"

In any crowd of young men there are sure to be some few with a taste for theological discussion. Mr. Prince, therefore, had little difficulty in gathering around him about a dozen students eager as himself to examine and test their faith. Chief amongst these were Arthur Rees, George Thomas, and Lewis Price, who, together with Prince, assumed the position of moral censors in the college. They held prayer-meetings, delivered wild extemporary discourses, denouncing, with fierce invectives, those who refused to amend their ways. Some of the students resented, naturally enough, being openly classed amongst the goats by Mr. Prince and his friends; and the college was the scene of lively encounters between the two parties.

Whilst at Lampeter he came across the writings of Gerhard Tersteegen, a German mystic, whose views had a profound influence on the mind of the young theologian. There was much in German mysticism that appealed to him; he could sympathise to the full with its scorn of human reason, its faith in the omnipotence of the invisible powers around; but, unfortunately, he had neither the mental strength nor the scientific training necessary to cope with the intellectual subtleties of the system. "I think I am more certain of the existence of unseen things than seen," he writes; "the latter are so uncertain and insecure, so mean, mutable, and ephemeral, that one might sometimes almost doubt whether they really are or are not." As he became more and more absorbed in the study of Tersteegen, his belief in the all-pervading presence of the Divinity became morbidly intense. With perfect sincerity he could declare, "not my will, but Thine"; but, as he pleaded, how was he to know "the Thine"? There is something terrible in the passionate prayer he uttered at this time for guidance. He had but one wish, one desire: to accomplish blindly, unquestioningly the will of his Creator; and in his terror lest he should do anything contrary to that will, he would sit motionless for the hour together, waiting, as he said, for a revelation to be made unto him. "I dread doing my own will even in the minutest circumstance," he cried. "My chief desire is to make no efforts, to have no will, to undertake no business, but to lie passive in the hands of God, as clay before the potter."

Meanwhile his influence on others was steadily increasing, and even those who liked him least are fain to confess that at S. David's he was without doubt the most gifted man of his day, intellectually as well as morally—the one, too, whose power for good was most strongly felt there.

On July 10, 1838, whilst still at college, he married his old friend and benefactress, Martha Freeman, and indulged in the wildest metaphors and similes to express the bliss resulting from this union. His marriage made no difference to the course of his life; he even lingered on at S. David's after his studies were ended, until some trifling incident occurred which he took as a sign that his work there was done.

In 1840 he was appointed curate of Charlinch, where he found himself in full charge of the parish, for the rector was an invalid and absent. He was keenly sensitive of the responsibility that rested upon him, and threw himself heart and soul into his work. He seems to have started with the idea that from this Somersetshire village he was going to send forth a message that would echo through England; and it was a heart-breaking affair for him when he found that even his own parishioners refused to listen to him. He had relied greatly upon his preaching for producing an effect—a mistake, seeing that at Charlinch it was a time-honoured custom to sleep during the sermon. As time passed, however, it became noised abroad through the neighbourhood that the new curate at Charlinch was preaching as never man had preached there before; and people flocked from other parishes to listen to his strange bursts of eloquence, which one moment thrilled them with terror, and the next soothed them with ineffable peace.

It was generally believed that when the rector returned he would speedily put a stop to his curate's vagaries, as they were styled; but, far from this being the case, no sooner was Dr. Starkey at home, than he conceived for Mr. Prince a strange infatuation, and up to the time of his own death seemed to have no higher ambition than to act as his curate's lieutenant. Yet, Dr. Starkey was not at all the sort of man one would have expected to be easily led astray. He had taken a good degree at Cambridge, he was possessed of considerable theological knowledge, and was an eloquent preacher. He had a decided taste for good society, too, and was himself connected with some of the best families in England. Such as he was, however, he soon became a mere puppet in the hands of Henry Prince.

The Charlinch revival began now to attract more attention. The little church was thronged with eager listeners, whose presence excited Mr. Prince to such a degree that he lost all self-control; his sermons became more mystic, more fervent, the personal element in them more strongly developed than before. He spoke of himself now as of one to whom a special mission was confided; and there were strange scenes, sobs and wild shrieks, in the village church when, fixing his eyes which burned like consuming fires upon some unfortunate who had attracted his attention, he delivered his message to him or her. According to Mr. Prince's own account, in October 1841, Dr. Starkey was suddenly stricken dumb, and he himself was deprived of the power of thought. Whilst in this state they were led by the Spirit to separate their congregation into two distinct classes, the saved and the unsaved. "I find myself called to separate the precious from the vile, and to unmask the real character of much of the religious profession of the day. I believe that God has given me a peculiar light for that purpose . . . I feel that God has called me to what I would term a discriminating ministry." Unfortunately, the exercising of this discriminating gift excited no small tumult in the parish, and this coming to the ears of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, he promptly requested Mr. Prince to leave his diocese. Mr. Prince refused to do so, unless commanded by a higher power; and engaged a large room, where he held services when the church was closed to him.

Whilst his struggle with the Bishop was at its height his wife died, literally worn out by the whirl of excitement in which she had been living. She had proved herself an unselfish and devoted friend, and her husband's grief at her death was intense. Before many weeks had passed, however, he married again; the unseemly haste with which the ceremony was performed exciting considerable scandal in the neighbourhood. The bride was Julia Starkey, the sister of his former rector. She was many years older than Mr. Prince, and, although she had some fortune, it was not large enough to justify the suspicion that he was actuated by mercenary motives in marrying her. What his real reason was it would be hard to decide; those who were with him at the time were firmly convinced that he married simply because he honestly believed that a divine command had been given to him to do so.

Soon after his marriage he accepted a curacy at Stoke, near Halstead. He only held it for two years, for he attempted to organise a huge revival; and when the Bishop of Ely prohibited the services, he appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, far from giving him sympathy, told him sharply that he must either renounce his peculiar method of teaching or quit the Church.

This was a terrible blow. Mr. Prince had certainly entered the Church from no ignoble motive, but he was an ambitious man, and he realised to the full that by leaving it he was throwing away his best chance, not only of doing good work in the world, but of ever becoming a power in the land. He was in delicate health, too, and poor, with no source of income but his stipend as a clergyman; yet so firm was his faith that the very proceeding condemned by the Archbishop was the special work God had given him to do, that rather than relinquish it, he renounced his brightest hopes, his most cherished ambitions. He and Dr. Starkey seceded from the Anglican church on the same day.

He then went to Brighton, sure of finding there willing listeners to the new Gospel he could now preach without let or hindrance. His addresses met with brilliant success, and before many weeks had passed he was surrounded by devoted admirers, many of whom were persons of good birth and education. It then first became apparent how much more keen was Mr. Prince's sympathy with the classes than the masses, a fact which, perhaps unjustly, has excited no little prejudice against him and his cause. Yet, at this time at least, whatever it might be later, it was not so much that he preferred the rich to the poor, as the cultivated to the rude; as a point of fact, he could influence the former more easily than the latter. As he had found at Charlinch, he was powerless amongst agricultural labourers, they were at once too robust and too brutal to be touched by any appeal he could make to them. His hearers in Brighton were more susceptible; they were many of them middle-aged gentlewomen, with more sentiment than intellect, feeling than common-sense; and to them this passionate young evangelist, with his thrilling voice and half-caressing manner, was simply irresistible; he could sway them at will, and never were they more powerless in his grasp than when, throwing aside all conventional restraints, he appealed to them as soul to soul.

Whatever might be the nature of Mr. Prince's influence on his new disciples, theirs on him was unmitigatedly evil. It would be difficult to conceive of anything more unwholesome for a man of his temperament than the social atmosphere in which he lived at Brighton. He was in a continuous state of excitement, one scene of *schwärmerei* following another with bewildering rapidity. Under the thin veil of religious friendship, ardent attachments were avowed to him, and flattery of the most fulsome kind was lavished upon him, a peculiarly subtle form of temptation for such an one as he. After being treated as a saint and a heaven-sent messenger for some months, he became more convinced than any of his followers of his own perfect sanctity, and of the reality of his mission. This belief was sure sooner or later to lead him into extravagance. So far there had been nothing in the doctrines he preached really repugnant to the teaching of the Church; in June 1842, however, he made a new departure. During that month Mr. Prince, with Dr. Starkey and all the leading men who had joined the new movement, held a meeting at Swansea to decide how best their propaganda should be carried on. The members collectively drew up with the utmost care some minutes which they handed to Mr. Prince to have printed. When they received copies of these minutes, they found that they differed widely from those they had authorised. Mr. Rees, until then Mr. Prince's warm friend, demanded an explanation. Mr. Prince's reply is, perhaps, unique in the history of controversy.

He announced, as if stating the most natural thing in the world, that he had made the alterations complained of in obedience to the command of the Holy Spirit. Years before he had written, "I am the pen of a ready writer; He mends the pen, He points it, He dips it in the ink, He guides it. What does the pen do? nothing; so do I." He now maintained that, having done nothing and said nothing, except at the Divine command, for so long, he had lost all individuality, and had become merely the shell in which the Holy Ghost was enshrined.

Now, they to whom Mr. Prince made this astounding declaration were educated men, lawyers, doctors, clergymen, civil engineers, who, in the pursuance of their various professions, must necessarily have been called upon to exercise common-sense and judgment; they might have been expected, therefore, at once to throw off the influence of one whom they must have been tempted to regard as a blasphemous charlatan, or a lunatic. But, far from doing so, with the single exception of Mr. Rees, they acknowledged the justice of Mr. Prince's claim, and undertook that for the future his wishes should not be opposed. In fact they at once assumed the position of disciples, whose duty it was to carry out the behests of their master. From that moment Henry Prince's fate was sealed.

Whilst on a visit to Weymouth, where he had a considerable following, he began to unfold his plans for the future. He was anxious to establish a headquarters for his followers. The coming of the Lord was at hand, he said; it therefore behoved him and them, who thought as he did, to prepare a dwelling, in which the elect should await this grand event. A small house was taken at Belfield Terrace, Weymouth, and it soon became known amongst the sect as the Agapemone. Whilst living there Mr. Prince used to hold meetings in the Assembly Rooms. During one of these, in the midst of a scene of incredible excitement, he startled his hearers by announcing that the hour of mercy was passed, that judgment alone remained, and that those who did not at once acknowledge him as coming from God were lost irredeemably. Some hundreds of converts were made that day, two of whom, a Mrs. Paterson, a handsome young widow, and her daughter, a lovely child of about thirteen, were destined to have considerable influence on the movement.

About this time Mr. Prince made the acquaintance of five sisters, named Nottidge, who each possessed a fortune of £6000. They soon became staunch Princeites. He and his friends knew that, if such converts as the Nottidges were to be preserved, they must be separated from their relations and guarded from outside influence. They, therefore, decided to build a large Agapemone, where all who joined the sect should be invited to take up their residence. Charlinch was selected as a suitable locality, because Mr. Cobbe had already built there a handsome chapel.

Mr. Prince has an intense love of the gorgeously beautiful: just as his soul revels in the glowing metaphors of Eastern poets, his eye delights in brilliant colouring and graceful outlines. He insisted that the Agapemone, as the home of the Elect, must be perfect in all loveliness, an emblem of heaven on earth. Loveliness, alas! here below is costly, and Mr. Prince was without money. Nothing daunted, however, he set to work to procure it, a process which soon led him into very shady paths. The series of acts by which he obtained possession of the fortunes of the Misses Nottidge can be justified by no sophistry; and, that his own adherents should have allowed such proceedings to pass without protest, is a proof of the utter demoralisation that had been wrought amongst them by their blind devotion to their leader.

As for him, headstrong, self-righteous, and blasphemously irreverent he had long been, and he now exhibited an utterly unscrupulous worldly cunning, which contrasted painfully with the simple-minded blamelessness of his early days. He insisted upon the strictest communism in the Agapemone—a rather one-sided arrangement, seeing that he was penniless, and the other inmates rich.

From one family he received £10,000, from the Nottidges nearly £30,000, whilst all who joined the movement sold their possessions, and threw the money into a common fund which was invested in his name.

The Agapemone was opened in 1849, and a motley crew of men and women soon assembled there. Fanatics, of course, the most of them were, totally devoid of reasoning power, guided solely by their impulses, their fears. Some perhaps had once honestly sought for truth, and had only succumbed to the influence of Mr. Prince when worn out mentally and bodily by a seemingly hopeless struggle to find peace.

At first the world heard little of what passed in the Agapemone; but as early as 1850 ugly rumours began to be spread abroad; tales were told of wives separated from their husbands, husbands induced to desert their wives, of young men and girls persuaded to break through all family ties and enter the Retreat.

Meanwhile Mr. Prince, "the Beloved," as he was now called, accompanied by a favoured few, drove about the country-side in Queen Adelaide's old semi-state coach, a cause of no small excitement to the natives.

In 1851 London was startled by the appearance of this coach, surrounded by a little troop of bareheaded guards on horseback. In it were reclining Mr. Prince and three of his friends, arrayed in more than royal splendour; they had come up to town to visit the great Exhibition. The turn-out excited great amusement amongst the crowd, but thinking men stood aghast at this proof of the depth of folly to which human nature could sink.

Then came the famous trials.

Mrs. Thomas, *nèe* Nottidge, who had been turned out of the Agapemone for daring to question the Beloved's authority, appealed to the courts to deprive her husband, Mr. Prince's warmest supporter, of the guardianship of their child. She had little difficulty in convincing the Vice Chancellor that the Agapemone was not a desirable home for a boy; and Mr. Thomas was formally declared unfit to have charge of the education of his son.

During this trial and others that followed, some curious revelations were made with regard to the belief of the sect: its one dogma seems to be implicit loyalty and obedience to Mr. Prince. His own views had undergone a fundamental change since he had taken up his residence in the Agapemone.

He had been wont to maintain that "prayer should be the great business of every day and take precedence of every other;" now, however, he taught that it was not a necessity, at least not for him or for his followers, nor was the observance of Sunday. They were no longer as other men, he said, therefore no longer bound by the old laws of morality; a doctrine that was not long in bearing fruit. From 1851 to 1856 was a dark time in the history of the Princeites.

Well might he write: "The whole of this period is replete with painful recollections; and, though a terrible reality, it seems at this distance of time like a hideous dream."

Then the awakening came, and with it terrible remorse, a remorse that might have led to good if it had not been stifled by an attempt to explain away the wrong done as something for which they, who did it, were in no way responsible.

A few years ago Mr. Prince published a tract, "A Sword in the Heart of Leviathan," in which the following passages occur: "It did please God, for a specific purpose, to leave these inhabitants of the earth [he had previously explained that by this name he means only the Princeites] to a certain extent to the deceit and wickedness of their own hearts, and to the power of the wicked one within them. I say He did this for a *specific purpose*, known and understood now, but not then."

"This strange and terrible state of things—it is now many years ago—continued for some time, the heat of the day waxing and waning, as it were, until it culminated in the bringing to light of that wicked one as the author of all the sin and evil in them, and the destruction of that Leviathan by the sword of the Lord, to their complete and most blessed deliverance."

This deliverance was effected, Mr. Prince declares, by the personal interposition of Christ, who appeared in the Agapemone, and there slew Leviathan, the devil, thus putting an end to sin by the death of the cause of sin.

Since that day, Mr. Prince maintains, he and his followers have lived in a state of blissful innocence; they can neither sin nor die, death being merely the consequence of sin.

And this doctrine he continued to preach, in spite of the fact that in the garden before his window is a row of graves, where, one after another, many of those who joined the sect have been laid to rest.

He offers no explanation of this fact, and, if questioned, merely murmurs, with a far-off dreamy look in his eyes, "We cannot die; without sin there is no death, and we are incapable of sin."

It is now forty years since Mr. Prince founded his Agapemone. His followers have never been more than a little band—some 600 perhaps at most—but a band devoted to him with a blind, unquestioning faith, which recalls that of Mahomet's host.

Some of the men who are with him today joined him half a century ago. They were then worthy, upright citizens, bent upon doing their best for the world, upon making it the better for their presence.

If they chose him for their leader, it was because they believed him truer, nobler, and more holy than themselves. He has led them through strange paths, paths of folly, nay worse; in his hands they have been as mere wax which he has moulded at will.

Firm in their conviction that he alone must be obeyed, they have cast aside, at his command, family affection, patriotism, every feeling that ennobled humanity, and they have never once murmured the while. The man who can inspire fidelity such as this is no mere vulgar charlatan.

MODERN IDOLATRY.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR, D.D.

From *The Sunday Magazine* (London), November, 1891.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image."—EXODUS xx. 4.

IT was probably in this brief form that the second commandment was carved on those old tablets of the rocks of Sinai; and it would take us far too long were I to attempt, to-day, to deal also with the menace and the promise appended to it. The subject is a very wide one, and I shall not be able to treat it fully; but, at least, I trust to be able to show you that this is a real commandment; that God did not address it to the Jews only; that it warns us against an inherent and perilous tendency of our nature; that God meant it not to be plausibly explained away, but to be studied, and to be kept. It contains, like all the commandments, a great principle; the great principle that God can be sought and found, not by any outward form, but only by him that hath clean hands and a pure heart.

1. The first commandment bids us to worship the one God exclusively; the second bids us to worship Him spiritually. The first commandment forbids us to worship false gods; the second forbids us to worship the true God under false forms. Ahab broke the first commandment when he taught the people of Israel to worship Baalim instead of Jehovah. Jeroboam broke the second commandment when he persuaded them to worship Jehovah under the cherubic emblem of a calf. But the two forms of sin are closely allied to each other. Jeroboam paved a broad path for Ahab. The identification of sensuousness with worship may easily become the first step to actual idolatry. Neither Aaron in the wilderness nor Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel pretended that their calves were more than emblems of—

> "Jehovah, thundering out of Zion, throned
> Between the cherubim."

Yet God sent His wrath like fire among those apostatising Israelites in the desert; His word brands the first king of Ephraim, in age after age, with the awful stigma of "Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin."

2. What is the primary meaning of the second commandment? Did it forbid the arts of painting and sculpture? Probably to the Jews it did, as to this day it does for the Mohammedans, who adorn their mosques and palaces only with patterns and arabesques. Among a nation of half-emancipated serfs, steeped in the recollections of idolatry, it was necessary to discourage the plastic arts. They needed the teaching not of painters and sculptors, but of prophets. Nevertheless, the literal force of the commandment lay in the words, "Thou shalt not make unto thee." A graven image, not made with the remotest danger of ever paying to it any sort of religious devotion, is, therefore, no sin against even the letter of this commandment.

3. But why was it necessary to say to the Jews, amid the thunders of Sinai, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image?" And why is it still necessary to republish that commandment to Christians?

4. The answer to that question is—Because there is, in the human mind, a perilous tendency to worship idols, which needs to be incessantly resisted. Israel was constantly starting aside into idolatry like a broken bow. Even in the wilderness they took up the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of their god Remphan, images which they had made to worship. Even under the burning crags of Sinai they made a calf in Horeb and worshipped the graven image; and the rebel king "doubled that sin at Bethel and in Dan." The seven servitudes of the Book of Judges were the appropriate retribution for seven apostasies; and, in Judah also, king after king, from Solomon to Manasseh, followed after idols. When the crushing ruin of the exile cured the Jews for ever of material idolatry, they substituted for it the hardly less fatal idolatry of forms and ceremonies, and of the dead letter of the law. This new idolatry, though it passed itself off as the perfection of worship, was even more dangerous than the other. It plunged the nation into a deadlier iniquity. Baal-worshippers had murdered the prophets; Pharisees crucified the Lord of life.

5. Hence all Scripture rings with denunciations of idolatry. Its poets and prophets pursue every form of idol with a burning storm of irony and indignation. If idolatry were an extinct temptation, half of Scripture would only retain an historic interest.

Alas! the temptation to idolatry, objective and subjective, open and secret, is still powerful. Men are too carnal, too sensuous, too inherently superstitious to be content with a pure, simple, spiritual religion. They always try to explain away the one fundamental message of Scripture, that religion means a good mind and a good life. It is so much easier to bow the head than to cleanse the heart; so much easier to multiply services than to be kind, and truthful, and humble. Hence the eternal Pharisaism which tempts them to teach that what God cares for is sacrifice, not mercy; fasting, not charity; orthodoxy, not goodness; instrumentals, not fundamentals; rites, ceremonies, genuflexions, shibboleths, scrupulosities of outward observances, not being meek, and pure, and just. And so even St. John, writing exclusively to Christians, in the last verse of his great Epistle, which is probably the last word of New Testament revelation—the dying murmur, so to speak, on the lips of him whom Jesus loved—says, as his farewell to them and to the world, "Little children, keep yourselves from idols."

6. The tendency, then, to idolatry lies deep in the human spirit. This is why the one thing on which the books of Moses insist is, "Ye saw no manner of similitude." We cannot have a visible God; or a God materialised under any outward form whatever; but the ignorant and sensuous multitudes insist on having one, and, in spite of the warning voice of all God's prophets, priests will give them one.

"The man that went within the cloud
Is gone, and vanished quite;
'He cometh not,' the people cries,
'Nor bringeth God to sight.'
'Lo! these thy gods that safety give;
Adore and keep the feast.'
Deluding, and deluded, cries
The Prophet's brother-priest:
And Israel all bows down to fall
Before the gilded beast."

Do not we likewise! God is a spirit. God is righteous. God is light. God is love. God is with you, and shall be in you. The kingdom of Heaven is within you. God dwells unseen in the holy heart. He cannot be seen or tasted or held in the hollow of the hand.

This is God's teaching. We need not ascend into Heaven to bring down Christ from above, nor descend into the abyss to fetch Him thence; but the Word is very nigh us, even in our mouth and in our heart. We Christians have less excuse than all others for idolatry; and yet we neither have been nor are exempt from the old temptation. We can be nearer to God in Christ even than the Apostles were—even than St. John was when he laid his head upon His breast. But His presence is not a material, it is a spiritual presence.

He has promised, "If any man hear My voice, and will open the door, I will come in to him, and make My abode with him, and will sup with him, and he with Me." But this way does not content us. No, we must have images and functions. We must have priests, systems, mediators, and material contacts and crosses and crucifixes, and holy coats at Trèves, and fancied epiphanies of the Virgin at Lourdes and La Salette.

We treacherously surrender into human hands—often into human hands base and feeble, intriguing and tyrannous—that royal priesthood wherewith God would fain crown and mitre every true man over himself. Christian idolatry always ends in sacerdotalism and superstition, instead of pure religion and undefiled. Against that outcome of idolatry, with its cruelty and immorality, the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, and its successor, the manly Puritanism, which expressed all that was most righteous in the heart of England, were a protest. Reformers and Puritans determined to stand fast in the freedom wherewith God had made them free, and not to be entangled again in the yoke of bondage. Their souls, taught of Heaven, determined to be crushed no longer "under a multitude of visible objects of worship," and under the weight of a priesthood, which, keeping them in ignorant servitude, bade them worship wafers and winking Madonnas. They believed that God was a jealous God, and flung all idols to the moles and to the bats. Were they doing otherwise than good Hezekiah did, when, because the Children of Israel burnt incense to it, he smashed to pieces the brazen serpent of the wilderness, and called it Nehushtan, a thing of brass? Priests and churches had been saying:—

"Lo, here is God, and there is God!"

The Puritan replied:—

"Believe it not, oh, man;
In such vain sort to this or that
The ancient heathen ran.
Though old religion shake her head,
And say in bitter grief,
The day behold at first foretold
Of atheist unbelief,
Take better part, with manly heart,
Thine adult spirit can
Receive it not, believe it not—
Believe it NOT, oh, man!"

II. My friends, the Jews were all the more forbidden to worship images of God, because they were taught to look for the *true* image of God, in Jesus Christ our Lord. Yet, when He came, they called it blasphemy to accept Him in place of the false images which their religious leaders had created. They crucified Him because He called God His Father. But we Christians have believed that claim. His life, His sinlessness, His resurrection, His ascension, the outpouring of His Spirit have proved it to be true. And are we, then, who hold this Catholic faith, to take upon ourselves to assert that God has repealed this His most emphatic commandment, and that He has given men a right, which they had not before, to bring the Godhead under visible forms? Are we to thrust the Church and its ceremonies into the place of God, and to accept the assertion of priests that they are, in any sphere whatever, His vicegerents? I say that by every image and picture by which men have been induced to worship, by every virgin or saint whose intercession has been asserted as necessary, every priest who has told men that they cannot get to God except through him and his forms and ceremonies denies Christ's revelation; which is that the way to the Father has been opened by the Son alone; and that the Father, through the Spirit, is drawing all men to Himself. The advent of Christ, so far from abrogating this second commandment, has re-enacted it with tenfold emphasis.

III. And has Christendom kept it? I think that in two ways Christians have dangerously infringed on its prohibitions.

1. They have done so by actual material images. In many niches of this Abbey we see that the statues have been removed. Who did it? The Puritans. And why? Because lamps had been hung, and incense burnt, before those stone idols. Were they not right? The Romanists might say, We did not worship the images, but only the Virgin through the images. Well, but we say that Virgin-worship was idolatry of the creature, not worship of the Creator, who is God for evermore; and the excuse of not worshipping the image was exactly the same excuse which Aaron and Jeroboam made, and never once did God admit it as valid. The whole history of Christendom is a demonstration of the peril and ruin of putting anything in the place of God or between our own souls and God. The material symbols soon come to be invested with an artificial sacredness, and men bow to things of wood and stone. The almost invariable result of the use of inferior means of producing religious excitement is to mistake the excitement for religion; to substitute it for righteousness; to base our religion upon the lie that the gilded thing of our idolatry is necessary to make God any nearer to us than before.

2. The crucifix, for instance, though half-Romanised Protestants are now introducing it into our churches, is both a dangerous and an unwarrantable material symbol. In the first few centuries Christians shrank from representing Christ at all. In A.D. 402 the highly orthodox and universally respected St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, tore down a curtain in a church of Palestine because it had an image of Christ woven upon it. He declared that to have such a picture in a church was contrary to the Christian religion, and bade the priest use it for some pauper's shroud. With still more holy reserve did Christian piety shrink from representing the Lord of glory in the brief passing moment of His death; in the brief passing spasm of the hour and power of darkness. Even when Christians began to use the symbol of the cross they made it a joyous and not a morbid symbol. We are told in one of the recent Romanising books of devotion, which now appear in shoals, to "keep a crucifix and adore every day the five precious wounds." St. Paul would have roughly characterised such adoration as an hysterical and degrading idolatry; and religion was never more corrupt in itself, nor more horrible in its iniquities against the bodies and souls of men, than in the days in which men most morbidly worshipped and sobbed over this idol of agony.

Apart from manifold other objections, it has been truly said that "this prostration of the soul before the image of the dying Christ makes our worship and our prayer unreal. We are adoring a Christ who does not exist. He is not on the cross now, but on the throne. His agonies are past for ever. He is at the right hand of God. If we pray to a dying Christ. we are praying not to Christ himself, but to a mere remembrance of Him. The injury which the crucifix has inflicted on the religious life of Christendom, in encouraging a morbid and unreal devotion, is absolutely incalculable." In the days of Primitive Christianity—and the difference in the religious results is infinite—the aspect in which the Lord of life was regarded was not that of an agonised sufferer, but as "the Incarnate Word, the Present Friend, the Prince of Peace on earth, the everlasting King in heaven. What His life is, what His commandments are, what His judgments will be," these are the thoughts on which men dwelt; "not mainly what He once did, or what He once suffered, but what He is doing now, and what He requires us to do; and" (as a great moral teacher has truly said) "the fall from that faith, and all the corruptions of its abortive practice, may be summed up briefly as the habitual contemplation of Christ's death instead of His life, and the substitution of His past sufferings for our present duty."

3. But without sinking into these errors and idolatries, it is fatally possible for us to break the second commandment by making to ourselves a false ideal of Christ. The proper meaning of idols is that in which our great Lord Bacon uses it; εἴδωλα—false, fleeting, shadowy images; subjective phantoms; wilful illusions; cherished fallacies. There are idols of the race inherent in the soul of man, which, like an unequal mirror, mingles its own nature with that of the light which it distorts; idols of the cave, which lurk in the secret abyss of each man's heart, reared there by his temperament and training, and fed with the incense of his passions; idols of the market-place, false conceptions of God which spring from men's intercourse with one another, and from the delusive glamour of words; idols of the school, false notions which come from the spirit of sect, and system, and party, and formal theology.

Our idol of the market-place tells us that custom and convention are valid excuses for national crime and individual faithlessness. Our idol of the cavern whispers to us that God will make exceptions on our behalf, and that our sin is only a soft and venial infirmity of the blood. Our idol of the school tells us that God is not a spirit, but that He is confined to temples; only approachable through priests; bound up in books; fussy about trivialities of worship; —or that He is the awful Moloch-god of persecution, who loves the racks and thumbscrews, and bale-fires of religious intolerance, until we feel inclined to say with Wesley to Whitefield, "your God is my devil;"—or that He is a God of infinite selfishness, caring only for His own glory; burning with implacable wrath against little deviations of opinion; delighting in narrow formalism and bitter exclusiveness:—or that He is a God of arbitrary caprice, treating men as though they were mere dead clay to be dishonoured at His will. All such idols are dashed to pieces by the ringing hammer strokes of the truth that God is Light, and God is Love.

And even the God-man, Christ Jesus, may be monstrously misrepresented to us in art and in theology. To Michael Angelo he was a wrathful avenging Hercules, hurling ten thousand thunders on the crushed, convulsed, demon-tortured, innumerable multitude for whom He died in vain. To many schoolmen His ideal was the self-absorption of the monkish cloister. Priests have offered us a dead Christ for the living Christ; an agonised Christ for the ascended Christ; an ecclesiastical Christ for the Divine Christ; a sectarian Christ for the universal Christ; a petty, formalising, Pharisaical Christ for the royal Lord of the great free heart of manhood; a Christ far off in the centuries instead of ever nigh at hand; a Christ of the exclusive fold for the Christ of the one great flock; a Christ of Gerizim, or of Jerusalem, or of Rome, or of Geneva, or of Hapsburg, or of modern Oxford, for the Christ of the eternal heavens and of the universal world.

IV. How then, in conclusion, are we to escape from these idols? When the Empress Constantia, in the fourth century, asked Eusebius, the most learned prelate of his day, to send her a likeness of Christ, he replied with hardly suppressed indignation, "What do you mean by a likeness of Christ? Not of course an image of Him as He unchangeably is; not of His human nature glorified. Such images are forbidden by the Mosaic Law . . . that we may not seem like idolaters to carry about our God in an image. Since we confess that our Saviour is God and Lord, we prepare to see Him as God. And if you set value on images of the Saviour, what better artist can there be than the God-word Himself?" Thus he refers the Empress to the Gospels to learn what Christ really was. If you will search and read them for yourselves, with open eyes, and souls cleansed from idols, you will see all that He was. You will see Him, stern indeed to the Pharisee and the hypocrite, and dwelling on the awful depth, grandeur, and searching keenness of the moral law, yet large-hearted, human, loving; tender to sorrow, with an infinite tenderness; merciful and compassionate, even to the guiltiest of His children who would come with tears to Him; releasing the demoniac, cleansing the leper, giving sight to the blind, feeding that hungry multitude which, the Pharisee said, knew not the Law, and were accursed; welcoming the outcast publican; suffering the penitent harlot to wash His feet with her tears, and wipe them with the hair of her head. Yet He was no haughty Pharisee; no weak and effeminate devotee; no sickly sentimentalist, imposing petty ordinances; no domineering priest inventing artificial sins;

no self-torturing ascetic; no self-macerating monk—and in all of these aspects He has been represented—but eating and drinking, and full of genial tolerance, and loving the games of the little ones, and beautifying with His presence and miracle the humble marriage-feast, and revealing God as the God of the lilies and the raven, of the fallen sparrow and the lost sheep, and the Prodigal Son;—as the Father in Heaven, by whom the very hairs of our head are numbered. Seek for God in Christ, and in what the Spirit of Christ will, if you seek Him, reveal to your own inmost hearts, and you will be freed from the perils of idolatry. Would you see Him as He is? You cannot see Him through chinks of ceremonialism; or through the blind eyes of erring man; or by images graven with art and man's device; or in cunningly devised fables of artificial and perverted theology. Nay, but seek Him in His own word; seek Him in loving lives; seek Him in sincere hearts, washed clean from traditional misrepresentations; seek Him in the revelation of Himself, which He gives to all who, by walking in His ways, see His face, and have His name written on their foreheads; and so will you be able to keep that admonition of the last word of all the New Testament revelation, "Little children, keep yourselves from idols."

"OUGHT MISSIONARIES TO BE MARRIED OR UNMARRIED?"

From *The Church Review and Church News* (Ch. Eng.), London, October 22, 1891.

THIS was the question asked by Mr. Athelstan Riley in his paper on foreign missions at the Rhyl Church Congress. Our readers know the answer which he gave, and the expressions of the dissent which it produced, even though he strengthened his case by quoting from "Notes on Missionary Subjects," by Dr. Cust, of the C. M. S., who, as Mr. Riley said, is, from his theological standpoint, the last person unduly to favour celibacy. It required some courage on Mr. Riley's part to take the unpopular side, but the disapprobation which he evoked was only that which prejudiced persons would naturally display when they heard opinions expressed with which they did not agree. It was perhaps impossible, in the course of reading a paper, for them carefully to weigh the arguments and evidence which the reader brought under their notice; but if those who dissented from Mr. Riley's statements have, since the Church Congress, taken the trouble (as we have) to read the paper carefully through, they cannot have failed to come to the conclusion that their disapproval was at best thoughtless. We have rarely seen the case put more temperately. Mr. Riley did not plead for compulsory celibacy; he did not deny that good work had been done by married missionaries and their wives; but he did plead, and with a power which was persuasive by reason of its very moderation, that the best work which had been done in the mission field was due to unmarried missionaries.

Let us examine his paper a little in detail. At the very forefront of his subject he placed the question of vocation. It is absolutely essential, if a man is to do good work in any calling, that he should have a vocation for it. The world has a proverb about putting round men into square holes, and the result of this geometrical performance is hardly satisfactory. We have known —who has not?—cases of priests placed in parishes where they were entirely out of touch with their surroundings—good men who, if they had been in a congenial atmosphere, would have done valuable work, but who, situated as they were, did no good either to themselves or to their parishioners. This evil is intensified when it exists in the mission field. We do not say that there are many missionary priests who have been ordained in the hope of obtaining a social position which they could not otherwise reach, and who had no hope of being ordained at home. But there are many other reasons why men embark upon mission work abroad, which plainly show that they are unsuitable. For instance, a passing enthusiasm which does not count the cost is a fatal bar to success in work for God. For foreign missions we want men who have really been called to the work, and who are suitable in other respects: in mental, moral, and physical acquirements. The next point is that of expense. Missions are so ill supported in England—though we believe that our nation will compare favourably with the rest of the world in this respect—that we need to see that our few hundreds of thousands of pounds are economically spent. Mr. Riley's figures here are well within the bounds of moderation. He estimates that four priests can live together for 300*l.* a year, and he allows them a modest 25*l.* apiece for clothes and incidental expenses, making a total of 400*l.*, or 100*l.* a year for each priest. The married missionary, he estimates, costs three times as much, counting in the extra passages for wife and children, illness, education, pensions, and so on. We take it that no one will affirm that a married priest is worth three celibates, or that he, with such assistance as his wife can give, will do as much work as they will do. We pass by without comment Dr. Cust's remarks on "returned empty bottles," and of the Bishops who have retired from their sees because their relations were ill. This witness is true, and, as Mr. Riley elsewhere observes, is not paralleled in the army. As a rule also, so experience proves, missionaries' wives cannot be reckoned to give active support to their husbands. They have their household duties to attend to, and their children, of whom they usually are prolific, to bring up.

Then there is the question of the comparative value of their work. Here Mr. Riley marshals an array of evidence which there is no gainsaying. It was to the missionary monks in ages gone by that Europe owed its conversion to Christianity; and we may add that it is from those missions which are conducted for the most part by unmarried priests that we obtain the best results. The work of the Cowley Fathers in India has been most encouraging; in what has been called "the romance of the mission field," the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, where the priests are almost entirely unmarried men, the success has been phenomenal; and we look for great things from the mission to Corea, where also the clergy are unmarried. Yet, as Mr. Riley pointed out, we cannot look to religious communities at home to supply us with missionaries. There is only one such order, the Society of St. John the Evangelist, at Cowley; and even were such communities to spring up, they lack the experience which is needful to enable them to adapt themselves to the varying needs of peoples in all parts of the habitable world. There are also special difficulties connected with religious communities, into which we need not enter now, because the more important point is that we have not got the communities, and must perforce do without them. The only tool to our hand is the secular clergy, and we have seen that when they are celibate they are more useful than their married brethren, and (great argument with John Bull!) we can get more of them for our money.

It must not, however, be thought that we undervalue the institution of a married clergy, either at home or abroad, when there are funds enough for them. A married priesthood is one of the glories of England. It enables a clerk to gain a footing in his parishioners' houses which would be difficult if not almost impossible for a celibate priesthood. In country parishes a wife keeps the priest from dried-up selfishness. She manages his mothers' meetings, and perhaps his guilds of girls. She knows her sex thoroughly, and prevents him from being imposed upon by the machinations of designing females. She suggests for the women of the parish deeds of kindness which would never enter into a bachelor's head. Possibly we should have said she *can* do all this; in many cases we know that she *does* do it. But however useful a wife may be in a country parish, or even in a town, she is out of place in mission work at home and abroad. In the slums of some large city she is, in nine cases out of ten, in a position to which she ought never to have been brought. In heathendom she is very expensive and practically useless. Therefore with Mr. Riley we conclude that missionaries ought not to be married; and while we value the system which obtains in England, we feel very strongly that marriage is not the crown of the priesthood, and that in many cases it is a hindrance rather than a help. The encouragement of voluntary celibacy by a vow renewable at stated intervals would do much to improve the usefulness of the clergy; while as for our missionaries, the less inducements, from a worldly point of view, they are offered, the better will be the men who volunteer.

EPISCOPAL FAILURES.

From *The Church Times* (Ch. Eng.), London, October 2, 1891.

The consecration of five Bishops on Tuesday last will have been accompanied by the prayers of thousands that these men may be faithful and true shepherds. "Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf; feed them, devour them not. Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost." Never were penned words more heart-searching, more tender, more solemn, than these which were addressed to the Bishops out of the Prayer Book on St. Michael's Day.

As we review the history of the last fifty years, we cannot but acknowledge thankfully that the episcopal standard has been wonderfully improved, to say nothing of that of the rank and file of the clergy. Time was when Bishops were chosen because they were related to great men or to royal courtesans. That was the time when men like Cornwallis and Moore and Manners

Sutton were made Archbishops of Canterbury; when one divine bet the king's mistress £5,000 that he would never be a Bishop, and she won her bet, and he paid her; when another good-looking young man married a governess that his titled pupil was sweet upon, and the young nobleman's grateful mother, who was too notoriously all-powerful with the king, got the deliverer a mitre.

Those days passed, and then came the age of the Greek-play Bishops, men of scholarship, but ofttimes with little else to recommend them. It was one of the first good results of the *Tract* movement to work a marvellous reform in the high places. Not that it, in any wise, procured the appointment of Tractarians; that was the last thing which the writers looked for. But the very first page of the *Tracts* was a trumpet-call to the Bishops. It told them sharply, earnestly, reverently, that evil as such a thing would be for the country, it might be a good thing for themselves to suffer martyrdom. And the effect was speedily seen in the higher aims and stricter attention to duty which the Bishops displayed. No loyal son of the Church would speak otherwise than affectionately and respectfully of such prelates as Howley and Blomfield, but it will hardly be denied that the *Tracts* had upon them the effect of most healthful tonics, especially as they had both made grievous mistakes in truckling to the Whig Government, and in promoting what they, no doubt, honestly believed to be reforms, but which were mischievous beyond expression to the Church. To them was mainly due the Ecclesiastical Commission, and, untold harm that Commission has done. If Church finances had been taken in hand in the spirit and with the noble aims which the present Primate has manifested, Church education, Episcopal supervision, and social improvement would have shown out very differently today. Still, as we have said, they were good men. Howley surrounded himself with scholars, and was always ready to promote them in the Church, and Blomfield's famous charge of 1842 was an evidence that he recognised the importance of the truths which the *Tracts* were bringing to light.

The men who were appointed to Bishoprics during the year that the *Tract* movement was in swing were on the whole creditable, and an improvement on past years. Men like Longley, Wilberforce, Lonsdale, all stand high in the esteem of those who remember them, though not one of them even approached the grandeur of Selwyn of New Zealand, who was consecrated in 1841.

But since? Well, we do not propose to dilate upon the history of the Church in general, nor of the Episcopate. If we follow the line indicated by our title, it is not because we want to rail, or throw stones at the tombs of the dead, but because we are bound to take warning by men's errors as well as to profit by their good examples. And we ask Churchmen, not in an ill-natured, but in a grave and anxious spirit, whether we do not well to point out what we hold to be blots on some episcopal careers that have come within our observation.

And first let us say, we do not quarrel with any man because he is not of our way of thinking. Thus Archbishop Tait's career was fearfully marred by his Public Worship Act, and he was no theologian, but we gratefully recognised the splendid hospitalities by which he raised the influence of his see to a higher pitch than it had reached since the days of Laud, his geniality, and his strong personal piety. Few men, so far as man can judge, were more saintly than Waldegrave of Carlisle, but the theological school in which he was bred was sour and narrow. Lord Shaftesbury's nominees were, with hardly an exception, highly respectable men, and the stout old earl, from his own standpoint, might be justified in endeavouring to stem the rise of Catholic opinion, but it was too strong for him. History and theology were both ranged against him.

No; the causes of failure in some from whom much might have been expected, and who achieved a good deal of popularity in their time, are not to be sought in their views. Take two men who in their day filled a very large space on the ecclesiastical stage, the brothers Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Winchester. As regards attainments they were respectable, though in no wise eminent. They were both amiable men; it has been said that nobody ever saw Archbishop Sumner angry. And it must be recorded to their credit that though they both disliked the Catholic movement, and fought against it as long as they could, they lived long enough to yield with a good grace to the revival of Convocation, and to tolerate, and even to approve, surpliced choirs, and reverent ritual. But both unhappily were defiled by the evil traditions which had come down to them, and no prelates of this century have been such thorough-going nepotists. Following Howley, who was rich, Archbishop Sumner could never have looked to carry on his munificent charities, but it was worse than this; he was mean, and pinching towards the labourers he employed. His brother was not so, he gave away a great deal, for he was rich; but there was not a lucrative living of the many which were at his disposal, which did not go to his children so long as there were any to provide for. And this was not the whole of his error. Nothing but mediocrity had a chance of promotion with him. How hard he was upon John Keble we all know. His influence is felt in his old diocese to this hour, to its injury. He stocked its parsonages with nobodies, to whom it was also a necessity to have nobodies as curates. Great numbers of these nonentities still live, and probably there is no diocese in England more oppressed with commonplace. Thumble and Quiverful, in Trollope's Barsetshire novels, might have been portraits of the greater number of Bishop Sumner's nominees. He had immense opportunities during his long episcopate, and there is not a man whom he preferred who can be pointed to as having wrought any permanent good work for the Church of England. His own charges, speeches, sermons, it need not be said, are long since forgotten. The warning which we are bound to draw from him is that there is something better than "safeness": learning, energy, theological knowledge, self-denial. Bishop Wilberforce had his faults, but his influence has been infinitely greater, because he knew a valuable man when he got hold of him, and encouraged him and used him.

Another episcopal failure, in our judgment, was Fraser of Manchester. We are perfectly aware that he was very popular, and that quite a chorus of praise followed his death. But it should not be forgotten that there is high authority for believing that it is not always well when "all men speak well of us." Bishop Fraser was too much given to "playing to the gallery." Nobody knew better how to win a passing cheer. He was jovial in manner, and very frequently indeed won applause by claptrap. People cheered at the moment, as we know the crowd will; but Manchester people, now that the froth is blown away, will tell you, in no uncertain terms, that Bishop Fraser's talk and profession were not accompanied by the solid and abiding worth of work which alone could benefit his flock.

We have not dealt with mere nonentities, men like Robert Bickersteth and Pepys, and Davys, and Wigram. Failures they would have to be pronounced if there was anything to talk of in the records of their episcopates, but there is nothing. Carlyle would have called them Tulchan bishops, and so left them.

We are on delicate ground when we refer, even slightly, to living men, and are loth to give pain; but we are bound to express our opinion that when a Bishop finds himself debarred by age and infirmity from performing the onerous duties which are laid upon him, there is only one safe and wise course to adopt. It was only yesterday that we heard a hardworking clergyman speaking sorrowfully of the discouragement and hardship which he felt, through never getting a sight of his Bishop. We earnestly trust, and are justified in believing, that Bishop Davidson is on his way to complete recovery, and to taking up the heavy accumulated arrears of work which he will find in his laborious and difficult diocese. He has begun well by refusing to become the tool of the Church Association, and by shewing that he can appreciate good men of all parties. Perhaps he has a tendency to pose as a Liberal, and to be somewhat ostentatiously friendly all round. The same may be said of one or two men, not Bishops, whom Archbishop Tait delighted to honour. But we will hope and believe that he will search out reality and the spirit of pious labour, and if God shall please to restore him, his episcopate will be blessed to the Church.

We have felt it needful to talk of failures. We might have talked, too, of some successes. We have had to express our differences without scruple with the late Bishop Lightfoot and with the living Bishop Ellicott, but we rejoice to do justice to their learning, and the good use they have made of it. Temple, Harvey Goodwin, Westcott, Moorhouse, Stubbs have all won themselves an honoured name as men of learning or practical power; and such men as King, and How, and Durnford will long be held dear in the memories of the faithful for yet higher qualities than these.

THE CHURCH IN HER RELATION TO LABOR AND CAPITAL.

HON. ALDEN SPEARE.

(*Read before the Ecumenical Conference, Washington, D. C., Friday, October* 16.)

From *Zion's Herald* (Meth. Epis.), Boston, October 21, 1891.

"THE Church in Her Relation to Labor and Capital," is the theme assigned me to discuss for the brief time allotted.

Under the blessing of God the church

was instituted and is sustained by the use of both labor and capital—a truth, we assume, that we are not desired to prove or discuss.

The church, by the spiritual changes which she has wrought in the lives of millions of her membership, has elevated them from habits and conditions that lead only to poverty and crime to habits of industry and thrift which have given them a competency of worldly goods and honorable and useful positions in the church and the body politic of their country; and, beyond and above all else, the church has made them fellow-laborers with Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world. In return for such priceless benefits labor and capital should give their first and best efforts to the church for its extension and prosperity.

We fancy, however, that it was the desire of those who proposed this theme for discussion, to elicit opinions, not only on the question of the relation of labor and capital to the church, but also their relation to each other, more especially in view of the growing conflict between them. For the purposes of this paper, we shall assume that the word "labor" may be defined as "the wage-earner;" and capital, the unexpended earnings and accumulations that own all vested property, and also the money that puts and keeps in motion all the varied and multiplied industries of the world.

Labor is generally acknowledged to be the primary, if not the only, source of wealth. That country and that people are most prosperous and happy where labor finds constant and remunerative employment; and as to employment, Daniel Webster used the following words: "The interest of every laboring community requires diversity of occupation, pursuits, and objects of industry. The more that diversity is multiplied or extended, the better. To diversify employment is to increase employment and to enhance wages. . . . Proclaim it everywhere, and make it a proverb, *Where there is work for the hands of men, there will be work for their teeth.* Where there is employment, there will be bread. . . . Employment feeds and clothes and instructs. Employment gives health, society and morals. Constant employment and well-paid labor produce, in a country like ours, general prosperity, content and cheerfulness;" and, we may add, should produce like results in all lands.

To furnish this "constant, diversified and well-paid employment," Mr. Webster would have enacted by the general government such a tariff as would furnish the money to pay our national expenses, and that should so guard our home industries that they could be continued at a profit to the capitalist, secure good wages to the laborer, and be increased as new avenues and inventions should come forward. Such is the essence of our American tariff, and, with the single exception of England, the feature of protection to home industries is found in the revenue laws of all European nations. England, on the contrary, entirely repudiates the protection feature, and collects duties only on articles she does not manufacture, or only to a limited extent, and theirs is a tariff "for revenue only." Her greatest statesman, Gladstone, tells us that our "laws make us produce more cloth and more iron at high prices, instead of more cereals and more cotton at low prices. . . . Increasing these, the American capitalist will find the demands of the world unexhausted, however he may increase the supply." In other words, he advises us, because we have the many and productive acres that respond to labor with such bountiful crops, to confine our attention to the cultivation of our land, and leave England and other countries to do our manufacturing for us, that by their lower wages and other economic conditions can produce them at lower cost than we can produce them, paying American wages.

It is well known that the agricultural laborer receives the lowest scale of wages paid to any class of toilers, for the good reason that least skill is required. Again, as to finding "the demands unexhaustible" for our cereals and cotton, in 1889 the corn crop of the United States was just about 2,000,000,000 bushels; in the spring of 1890 corn was selling, in Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska, at from 8 to 13 cents per bushel—say one half the cost of production—and the American capitalist (in this case the farmer) did not find the demand of the world "unexhaustible," and thousands of bushels were consumed in place of coal. In 1890 we harvested a cotton crop of over 8,600,000 bales—several hundred thousand bales more than the world could consume. Had the crop of the present year been equally large, it would have been an appalling calamity to that section of our country which devotes so large a portion of its labor and capital to the raising of cotton.

If we were to follow the teachings of England's greatest political leader, and close our manufacturing establishments on all products that we cannot make as cheaply as the same articles can be laid down on our shores from any other country, and if we should put the millions that are now finding constant employment at more than double the wages of the agricultural laborer, also, on our farms and plantations, it needs no seer to forecast the result. Whether this, the protective line of legislation, is wise for any other country than America, we express no opinion, satisfied that it has been greatly advantageous to this nation, and has contributed, more than anything else, to what we now find, namely, a people unexcelled in all the opportunities for useful and well-paid employment; where the price of the day's labor will purchase more food and implements of husbandry, and, in fact, more of all the essentials necessary for the sustenance and comfort of the wage-earner, than in any other part of the world. We freely admit that many articles of luxury are sold lower in other countries; and if the wealthy desire them, we are quite willing they should pay the enhanced prices caused by our higher wages.

It is an acknowledged fact that the average pay of the wage-earner in America is eighty to one hundred per cent. more than in England, Ireland and Scotland, and nearly or quite two hundred per cent. more than on the continent of Europe. Such being the fact, is it strange that the laborers of other lands are coming here at the rate of a half-million a year? We fear, however, they are coming quite too rapidly to be properly educated and assimilated into our body politic. Notwithstanding the prices here paid for labor, notwithstanding the purchasing power of the day's wages, still we find discontent and strikes, and sometimes riots. No human foresight has been able to prevent them, no legislature wise enough to enact laws that shall provide an adequate remedy for their prevention or cure. Possibly, we may say probably, the law providing for State arbitration has worked more satisfactorily to both employers and employees than any other method yet devised. It seems to us that the enactment of an immigrant law that should prevent any country from being the dumping-ground for all classes of inhabitants that are undesirable at home, would be just between different countries and beneficent to the inhabitants thus protected.

In a country like our own, under a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," the elective franchise should not be given to any foreigner till he can read and write the language of the country of his adoption, and has been long enough a resident to become thoroughly conversant with the laws and customs of the land, be that time ten or twenty-one years. Without this no one is competent, or has a just claim, to take part in the body politic. This leads us to remark that we deem it a great evil that in all countries and States children are not taught the language of the country, so that when they become of age they will be better equipped for the duties of freemen and all the social and business concerns of the country of their fathers' adoption.

Since the Divine decree that "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the ground," it has been the lot of mankind to labor, and there can be no doubt that labor is to us as beneficent as it is necessary. Happily for us in America, labor is honorable, whether it be with the muscles or the brain; and small is the number who do not employ one or both. For that class "whose chief good and market of his time be but to feed and sleep," we have no place or use. The book of Proverbs is full of promises to the diligent—that "he shall bear rule," that "he shall be made fat," that "the substance of the diligent man is precious." "Wealth gotten by vanity shall be diminished, but he that gathereth by labor shall increase." "Seest thou a man diligent in business? he shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before mean men." "He that tilleth his land shall be satisfied with bread." "He becometh poor that lendeth with a slack hand; but the hand of the diligent maketh rich;" and St. Paul's endorsement is: "Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." Need we look farther for promises of rich reward to the diligent, for the necessity of thrift and carefulness in guarding the reward of our industry? that activity in business is not inconsistent with fervor of spirit while we serve the Lord? But we look in vain for a promise of anything that is desirable to the slothful and improvident; on the contrary, penury and want are the inevitable result. Wesley told his followers to "get all they could, save all they could, give all they could." We say, get all you can honestly, by diligence in honorable avocations; give, *at least*, each year, one tenth of all your earnings for religious and benevolent purposes; save at least another tenth, to be safely invested; and, misfortune excepted, every one may have a competency, and want and misery be banished from our land.

But even in this most highly favored land we have discontent, strikes, and attendant evils. Would we were wise enough to divine the remedy! Of late, the rapid increase of large fortunes by a few individuals has created great uneasiness on the part of many thinking men and widespread discontent among the wage-earners. We do not share these fears, and believe the discontent uncalled for and unwarranted. If we look at the facts as they here exist, we shall not find ten families of immense fortunes whose wealth has been in the family more than three generations. Nearly all of the men of wealth of to-day have been the architects of their own fortunes; and most of these have earned the entire amount of their present property by their savings and business enterprise, receiving nothing by inheritance. We have no fears but that these fortunes will soon vanish, either by rash speculation or wasteful extravagance, and those of the following generations will join the wage-earners in some form or other; or, as is so often and so sadly the case, the possession of wealth will lead to habits of indolence and so-called high living, with its attendant dissipation, ending in penury and an early and unhonored grave. Of a circle that gave a dinner to our late President Grant, where the majority were said to be in possession of more than $20,000,000 each, but few remain, and the fortunes have been divided and in some cases are already out of the name of the family. It has been the pleasure and the privilege of one of them to make the largest and noblest gift of this or any other age in the history of the world, in giving $20,000,000 for the establishing and maintenance of a university, broader in its scope—and it is his desire and purpose that it shall also be more beneficent in its results—than any existing university. When in coming years California's roll of honor shall be written, high upon that roll shall stand the name of Leland Stanford! And in this city, when shall rise the American University for which Bishop Hurst is confidently asking only $10,000,000, there will also be found the same name among the first of those contributing to the enterprise. Without large wealth, the founding and endowment of the universities, public libraries, hospitals, art galleries, and other eleemosynary institutions, which are so abundant in our land, would be an impossibility, except to a limited extent. We therefore believe that it is not by accident that large wealth occasionally exists, and that He who sees the end from the beginning will in His own way and time cause it to be used or disseminated for the good of mankind and the advancement of His cause. But that man to whom God has given the opportunities and the abilities for large accumulation, who, when wealth has come to him, uses it only for his personal pleasure and aggrandizement, when he shall pass over the river, leaving all behind, will find no gate open to the city of the blood-washed throng; but that dread sentence shall be his—"Depart from Me! Insomuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to Me."

The duty of the capitalist to the wage-earner is manifest—that he should pay for labor performed as high wages as the profits of the business will warrant, reserving for himself only a reasonable return for his own services and capital employed. This the wage earner has a just right to claim, and if business of all kinds at all times were alike prosperous and profitable, it were a matter of easy adjustment; but it is entirely the opposite; the profitable avocation of one year is not infrequently the unprofitable of the next, and the wage-earner cannot work without compensation when the business is a losing one. Hence it is claimed by some that labor is a commodity, to be bought and sold at its market value; but the wage-earners see in this neither justice nor equity; hence trade unions and combinations to establish and maintain the highest possible wages and the least number of hours to constitute the day's labor.

We have before stated that the average wages of all laborers in America is more than eighty per cent. higher than is paid in any country, and we do not think them too high, and hope they will never be lower. If we note the reward that capital has received, with rare exceptions, we shall find it slowly but surely receding in its returns. Twenty-five years ago, we believe the average returns were six per cent., possibly seven, but for the last ten years less than four per cent. Hence we see government and municipal bonds, where the investor is sure the element of risk is eliminated, selling at a price that does not give the purchaser two and one-half per cent.; and allow us to say in this connection, that professional men, and, above all, the minister of the Gospel, should never, *never* speculate, or touch anything in the line of speculative securities!

A few words as to the hours that should constitute the day's labor. It seems to us this question is vastly more vital to the wage-earner than to capital. For a moment let us assume that the present scale of wages for all classes and conditions is as near equitable as is possible to make it, and ten hours the day's work, and that the demand is made and met that eight hours shall hereafter constitute a day's labor for the wages now paid for ten. What is the result? Will not all the products of labor be enhanced in cost one-fifth, and the purchasing power of the day's labor be reduced one-fifth, unless a part or the whole of the one-fifth can be taken from what now goes to capital? Can this be done?

We have stated that for the last ten years the average return to capital has not been four per cent. What more cutting can it bear? If further pressed, the "goose that now lays the golden egg" of constant and well-remunerated employment is killed, our manufactories must be closed, and the laborer be left without employment, if the enhanced cost of production is not added to the goods produced, and which must be paid by the consumers, of whom the wage-earners and their families are the great majority.

We are in accord with the proposition so generally accepted, that politics shall not be the subject of pulpit discussion; we are also fully persuaded that the pulpit should speak with no uncertain sound on all subjects appertaining to the well-being, prosperity, and happiness of the people, whether for time or eternity, commending and encouraging the right, condemning the wrong, whether the subject be a national or a State law, the attitude of capital in its dealings and relations to the wage-earners, or of the wage-earners to capital. "The rich and the poor meet together, the Lord is the Maker of them all," and He will hold each responsible, to the full measure, for the use made of the abilities and opportunities given—the rich and the poor alike, the clergy and the laity.

THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE.*

BY PROFESSOR CRAWFORD H. TOY.

From *The Christian Register* (Unit.), Boston, November 12, 1891.

It may seem strange that the existence of such an organization as this Sunday School Society should be called for. The Bible, it might be supposed, would need no pushing, but would command the reverent admiration and love of the world. Yet we know that it is not so. The prevalent ignorance of the Bible among all classes of our community cannot be denied. Among the educated and the uneducated alike we fail to find a broad and intelligent acquaintance with its content and its form.

But, strange as this may seem, we must recollect that it is true, not only of the Bible, but of all the world's great classics,—the Greek, Roman, Italian, French, German, English. How many people are intelligently acquainted with Virgil, Homer, Dante, Shakspere, have really any knowledge of their deeper-lying thought, and have felt the touch of their true inspiration? The Bible shares this peculiarity with all the great classics of the world, that it is not a book which is read and studied by the masses. Nor is this really strange, when we look at the circumstances. Consider that these books are enfolded in the mists of a greater or less antiquity. They sprang by a natural process out of certain usually-limited circles. They were addressed at first to small communities, a family, a clan, a city, a small nation. The Homeric poems, rising, no one knows how, like an exhalation, out of the mind and soul of the Greeks in the dim old days, were sung by unknown singers to little groups of hearers. The Chinese and Indian classics were at first spoken and chanted to small circles. Dante sang his songs to the few, and Shakspere was comparatively unknown to his own time. The classics were addressed to particular needs, and grew out of the peculiar social conditions of the special societies in which they originated. So, after the lapse of years, it happens of necessity that their framework and drapery become strange or unintelligible. The ideas are embodied in words and terms which are unfamiliar, and the unfamiliar is always repellent. It is hard to find the truth of the friendly face under a foreign garb. With every generation, the strangeness of garb increases, and it becomes more and more difficult to get into contact with the thought. The growing obscurity makes it harder and harder to understand the old writing.

Moreover, great works necessarily address themselves to the few, not to the many. The greatness of their ideas, that which gives them their eminence, is not comprehensible to the masses, and does not call forth their sympathy. In the sphere of literature, of religion, and of science, the greatest things must be reserved for the few. This is true, at any rate, in the present condition of society, and must be so for a long time to come. The great thoughts of the world lie far off from us. Like the mighty architectural monuments of antiquity, they stand outside the circle of our common occupations, withdraw themselves from our sympathies, and do not enter into the material of our lives.

---

* Address given at the annual meeting of the Unitarian Sunday School Society. Phonographically reported for the *Christian Register*.

This would seem to be a dark picture of the world's greatest literary productions. But we must recollect, on the other hand, that the influence of these great works is not to be measured simply by the extent to which they are read and studied. The few to whose lot it falls to study them deeply become the intermediaries between them and the mass of men. From these the dominant ideas, often in diluted form, pass to the world at large, and color its life. Though Homer, Dante, and Shakspere be sealed books to us, nevertheless they, with all the great poets and artists of the world, are a measurable influence in our lives. We are what we are, and live and move and have our being in such wise as we do because of their influence. They enter subtly into the composition of our souls, though we may not be able to analyze our inner life and ascribe to the past what is its due.

This silent potency is especially marked in a liturgical book. Men become used to its words and its forms of thought, and acquire a certain external knowledge of it. The Bible has this advantage in a marked degree. It is read in the pulpit, in the family, in the school, and quoted in books, magazines, newspapers, and addresses. Certain parts of it become household words, help to form the material of our thoughts, and thus exert an influence which is far from inconsiderable.

However this may be, none of us can be content with this sort of influence. We feel that there must be something far deeper. It is due to this book and to all the great classics that they should profoundly shape the life of the world. That they do not do this is a fact to be grieved over. They are the world's true sustenance. They have cost its life-blood. They represent the intensest human struggle, the highest outcome of human thought and experience. They embody the world's greatest ideals. Shall we let them go? Shall we suffer that they stand outside the circle of our lives? It is as if one lived next door to a great orator and never heard him, or to a man of noble moral power and never came into contact with him, as if one were within a stone's throw of a great picture-gallery and never set foot within its doors. It is an intolerable thing that these great books which constitute the very best nourishment of the human soul should be allowed to pass out of our existence, as they tend to do. Every year, every century, every age, makes them dimmer. They move farther away. We come more and more into the circle of new ideas, and it is the things of the present that are most potent with us. It is the experiences of our daily life that seem to demand most attention and receive the warmest welcome. We hear much of "the burning questions" of the day. It is a good phrase, and has its lesson for us. It behooves us to throw ourselves eagerly into the current of the times and struggle and fight manfully. But let it be remembered that we make a very great mistake if we imagine that the deepest interest of the world's life has been reserved for this time, that the best culture of the world is to be derived from participation in the current questions of the day. Let us bear in mind that there is much in these that is merely local and transient, and that it is to the great monuments of human thought that we must largely look for that which is permanent and solid.

We are not content that the best shall be neglected. But how shall we help ourselves? How shall we bring it to pass that the world shall feel the power of its greatest things? I suppose we must say that the abiding result must be left to the slow-moving forces of education. It must be by the process of general culture that the world shall be brought into sympathy with the great things which itself has produced. This will take generations and ages. Possibly we may look afar off, into the dimmest distance, and see the time when men shall choose and enjoy what is best. We have not yet reached that time. The books which we oftenest choose for instruction, recreation, and upbuilding, are not the best books. The race has not been trained to a genuine intellectual and moral sympathy with the best thought. That consummation seems far off. To it, perhaps, the educating forces are driving us; but meantime we must act for ourselves. What can we do just here and now to help the world on its way?

We must try to do two things,—to separate the permanent in the classics from the transient and local, and then to give vitality and life to that which is permanent. The study of the Bible must therefore be scientific, literary, and moral-religious.

It must be scientific because scientific study is necessary, in order that we may comprehend the difference between the transient and the permanent. Take an illustration from the New Testament. We all know how the study of the parables of the New Testament has been abused. One of the most amusing chapters in the history of Bible exegesis would be the narrative of parable misinterpretations. Some expositors have taken, for example, the parable of the ten virgins, five of whom were wise and five foolish, and from the equality in numbers of the wise and the foolish have concluded that the number of the saved would be equal to the number of the lost. This distorting process (abundantly exemplified in parable exegesis) might have been avoided by the use of the scientific method, which would show what belonged to the drapery or framework of the parable, and what was entitled to be set forth as the permanent element. This very undesirable sort of procedure has been employed more or less in connection with all parts of the Bible. The cure for it is study, critical, historical, archæological, and exegetical. That is to say, we must find out the social and intellectual conditions under which ancient authors wrote, must endeavor to set aside that which is temporary, due to the limitations of their own time and thought, and preserve that which then remains.

We all know that a thorough critical study of the Bible demands more time than most people can give to it. Such a study of the Pentateuch alone, or the Homeric poems, or the "Divine Comedy," is the work of a lifetime. But the facilities for the critical examination of the Bible by non-specialists are very great. The materials for such investigation have been popularized. There are books accessible in which not merely the results, but also the processes, are set forth, so that one who is able to give only a little time to reading may fairly comprehend the methods of work and intelligently use them.

But, without urging this (a matter which may be left to the feeling of the individual persons concerned), let me submit that knowledge of exegesis is a necessity for everybody who teaches the Bible. It is a simple proposition that one who undertakes to explain a book should know something of what it means; but it is a proposition that is often held in slight respect. The popularization of scientific exegetical results has gone so far that no one need deny himself the pleasure of fairly comprehending and intelligently stating the meaning of the greater part of the Bible. Precision of quotation and exposition is an imperative duty. There are some passages, to be sure, that have become household words, in a form that does not set forth the meaning of the Hebrew or Greek. "The mark of Cain" (that is, the brand of murder) is a good English expression, though not a Biblical one. Not a few phrases have thus passed in altered shape into our English material. Far be it from us to remove them. Let them stand; but there is no reason why we should not here and elsewhere know the real meaning of the original. This curiosity and this loyalty we owe to the Bible as a classic. It is, moreover, usually the fact that in such cases the real meaning of the text is better than that which we have affixed to it.

It used to be, and perhaps still is, a custom among Scotch preachers to give expository sermons,—to take a passage from a prophet, a psalm, an epistle, or a gospel, and expound it, verse by verse, Sunday morning or at some week-day meeting. I have been told by persons who have heard these sermons that they are exceedingly interesting. They give a regular process of thought, and the result is a much better comprehension of the text on the part of the people. It has always seemed to me that this method, both in pulpit and in Sunday-school, would be eminently proper for us. It would be in the nature of an educating influence; it would add to the freshness of teaching, and would quicken moral as well as exegetical interest.

But I must pass from this point to make a special plea for the literary study of the Bible. Such study is desirable both on its own account, for the sake of literature, and because it will be a preparation and a help for the higher moral-religious study. The material is abundant. The Bible is full of it. We know that some of the noblest literary treasures of human thought are to be found in this book. And let it be observed that the explanation and inculcation of the literary side of the Bible really devolves upon the Sunday-school and the pulpit, because, as a matter of fact, it is not attempted elsewhere. We have books and lectures and societies for the exposition of the literary side of the great Greek, Latin, German, French, and English writers,—Dante and Shakspere, Euripides, Virgil and Terence, Goethe, Lessing, and Heine, Shelley and Browning. But we have almost nothing of this sort on the Bible. Here and there one hears something, but not often. If we who profess to value the Bible do not do it, it will not be done. It is certainly worth doing as a literary education. Why should Homer be studied, and not Job? Why should the stories of Livy be set before the people, in their literary form, and not the stories of Genesis? I know that the theological side of the Bible has tended to shut out everything else. We get out of the habit of thinking of it as a literary book. There was a time when it was held profane to talk of its literary value, because, in comparison with its theological content, everything else seemed trivial and disturbing. But that time has passed. The Bible on all its sides is open to us, and it should be studied in all its fulness. The prose stories of the Old and New Testaments belong to that department of Semitic literature in which it is pre-eminent in sincerity, *naïveté*, picturesque simplicity, and vitality; and in the Semitic field (including "The Thousand and One Nights") there is nothing better than the Bible stories. They should be presented in their own attractive literary form. While we have some books which attempt this, we have nothing quite satisfactory. In the stories of Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Jeremiah, Paul, there are a thousand niceties of expression, delicacies of literary art, admirable pictures of character and manners. These ought to be brought out in a way to make them interesting to the smallest children as well as to the elders. The character-pictures, particularly, have more than a literary value. They have the stimulating power of the great ideals embodied in them.

I wish there were time to speak with some fulness of the prophetic and poetic literature of the Old Testament and of the epistles of the New Testament. There are signs of awakening interest in this direction, chiefly in regard to the Old Testament poetry. But it is only a beginning that has been made; and the wide field of Bible literary study lies before us almost untouched, and offering rich results for him who chooses to enter it.

Of course, all these lines of study are to be considered as introductory to that higher moral-religious side which is most familiar to us in ministerial and Sunday-school work. The ethics of the Bible may be said to have become common property. "Thou shalt not steal!" is now very generally accepted as a proper rule of life. We all of us give a theoretical adherence to the law of love, though we are far from practical obedience to it. This is, of course, an important part of the work of the Sunday-school and pulpit,—to make these ethical requirements real. It is unnecessary to refer to the importance of the Biblical religious element proper. But it appears to me that, for our special teaching-work, the most desirable thing is to bring out the moral struggle which is visible in the Bible. Too often this side of its ethical content is neglected. Too often we surrender ourselves to the traditional view which regards it as a cut-and-dried book, and all its personages as so many made-up figures who act and speak thus and thus as a matter of course. A prophet is thought of as a man who had nothing to do but stand and let his words flow out of his mouth, and a psalmist as one in whose faith and peace there was no agony of effort. So a certain unrealness has been given to Biblical characters and moral processes. Its people seem lay figures, with no abounding ethical life. And yet the contrary is the fact. The prophets and psalmists of the Old Testament and the apostles and other writers of the New Testament were men who had lived through moral struggles. Of Jeremiah, for example, there can be no doubt that his soul was torn asunder with doubts and fears. He and all the others lived in an atmosphere of intellectual, moral, and religious questioning. They were in the midst of revolutionary processes, and were struggling against their times and against themselves. They were reformers, idealists, and no more men of straw than was Martin Luther or Channing or Theodore Parker. The Bible is full of the traces of conflict and of wrestlings of the soul, now cast down to the ground by doubt, now rising again, inspired by some great ideal, some supreme conviction. These are visible not only in prophets and psalmists, but in the New Testament, where Paul's life is full of the indications of these profound inward struggles, and the gospel history shows something of this conflict in the mind of Jesus. These pictures of moral struggle are of immense educational power in the world. For the world is educated not by finished codes of ethics, but by moral conflicts: men are inspired more by the spectacle of struggle than by the picture of perfection.

In the Bible, moreover, the ethical conflicts are not isolated, but the individual lives form one continuous line, united in the solidarity of a great principle and a great national life battle. The history of old Israel from the beginning to the end is the picture of the greatest moral contest that the world has ever seen. It is on this side, particularly, that the Bible takes its place among the world's classics. On the literary side the supreme place may be given to Greece, Rome, and Modern Europe. The highest place on the side of ethical effort belongs to ancient Israel. And this not because of the sacred character impressed on the Bible, nor because of the associations which bind it to our lives, but because it exhibits, as other literatures do not, this long-continued and finally successful effort to organize the ethical life of the world. It gives the history of moral thinkers who grasped after ideals that they often felt but feebly and saw but dimly, but who went on bravely, never abashed or discouraged by doubts or failures, till they finally laid hands on that which they sought. And to-day we are what these uncompromising thinkers have made us. These two elements, so distinct in Old Testament and New Testament literature, — the moral struggle and the moral, uncompromising determination, — are, above all, what we need.

It is for these things, for a really intelligent and genuinely literary study of the Bible, and of the Old World's moral-religious achievement, that this society stands. It is to these things that we ought to dedicate ourselves.

THE DEACONESS WORK.

BY BISHOP WILLIAM X. NINDE, D.D.

(*An address before the Ecumenical Conference, Washington, D.C., October*, 1891.)

From *The Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Meth. Epis.), Chicago, November 4, 1891.

THE deaconess movement in this country is a novelty. I suppose nobody dreamed ten years ago that in the near future we should see numbers of devoted and thoroughly trained women, trained to be nurses and missionaries, moving about our streets and in the habitations of the poor in a uniform garb. We knew something of the Lutheran deaconesses in Germany; we had some knowledge of the sisters of Bethany among our brethren in Germany; we gained some knowledge of the good work of the noble organization of our Wesleyan brethren in England, and there came into our hands something of the scanty literature on the subject. And, among the rest, that charming monograph from the pen of the president of the British conference. At length the idea took root in our soil, and as a result of it a very gifted and devoted lady, widely known and esteemed among us, with the help of a few friends, and without churchly sanction, organized the first deaconess training-school, whose home is in the metropolis of the great west. And from this start it was an easy matter to appeal to the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal church and engraft this movement upon the economy of the church. Methodism has always taken kindly to women, and the general conference of our church was disposed to do anything reasonable for a woman, and so restored the ancient order of deaconesses.

From the start the movement has been a marvellous success. Indeed, I may say that the success of the movement in this country has surpassed the expectations of its most sanguine friends. We have twenty-one homes in many of our great cities. We have five hospitals with free dispensaries, and a number of young women who are eager to join the ranks of the noble sisterhood. The movement in this country I may say has been from the start almost universally popular; and yet it would be hardly candid not to admit perhaps that there are those here and there who are disposed to regard the movement with misgiving, if not positive alarm. It is said, for instance, we are aping the methods of the papal church. We look with well-grounded suspicion on the papal church. We are extremely sensitive in this country regarding her. We believe that the Roman Catholic church is being rapidly presbyterianized in this country; yet we believe her to be an encroaching and corrupt form of ecclesiasticism. And in some cities of our country the sensitiveness is largely magnified. In one of the most important cities of our seaport so sensitive has the community become in regard to the encroachment of the Roman church and its attitude toward the public schools, that the friends of that movement in that city are unwilling that our sisters should appear on the street in a distinguishing garb. Now, I am willing to borrow from the Roman Catholics or anybody any good thing they may possess and which we can utilize to advantage; but I am sure of one thing, that our order of deaconesses, without requiring any unscriptural views, with its freedom from priests and jesuitical arts and practices, is so radically different from the Roman Catholic practices that we can hardly be charged with adopting the methods of the papal church.

We are sometimes told—it may be a graver complaint—that in establishing the order of deaconesses we are removing woman from her proper sphere, and really aiding at the destruction of the home. Now nobody loves the Christian home more than I do, and I invoke God's blessings on the multitudes of women who are content to be wives and mothers, their throne the fireside, their empire the sacred seclusion of home. But I would ask God's blessing upon that comparatively small class of women who are just as heartily content to forego the blessing of a single home that they may mother the thousands of homeless ones. Who will be so daring as to attempt to define the proper sphere of woman? Now, surely, her sphere has enlarged since the dawn of the Christian dispensation. How wondrously it has altered in the memory of us all. I suppose fifty years ago it would have been difficult to find a woman outside of domestic life; and yet to-day woman serves us behind the counter, she writes and copies in our offices, she prescribes for our sick, she pleads in our courts, she edits our newspapers, she lectures from our platforms, preaches from our pulpits, and nobody says her nay!

Now, I wish to say this one thing: In our times there is a growing faith, a reckless faith, in the implanted instinct of the human race. There is a faith in the common-sense of men and women to keep themselves in the right place. In this day when the populace rules under God this is our only protection. Yet there are persons who are willing to trust anybody's intuition but woman's. They fancy that they must be under heavy restraint. They would put a bit and bridle upon her, for fear that if she should be allowed to follow the unfettered tendency of her nature she would ruin herself and throw society into ruin. I know there are erratic women in the world; there are silly women and monstrous women, just as there are silly and monstrous men. But I have a profound and abiding conviction that the representative woman can be trusted. If you cannot trust women, who in this dark world can you trust? If we cannot trust our wives and mothers, our daughters and our sisters, where upon the human side will our anxious hearts find rest? But we can trust her. I believe in woman—in woman, with her spiritual clear-sightedness; in woman, with her deep moral convictions; in woman, with her courageous fidelity to duty; in woman, with her unselfish and consuming love.

I am convinced of another thing—that God never will save this world without a large instrumentality of woman. We all believe in that. But I go further—I do not believe we shall ever reach the unreached and seemingly unreachable masses of the large cities without woman's participation in that work. She has wonderful adaptations for it. Chicago is a moral storm center; yet several years ago a woman, a lonely woman, went into the Bohemian center. She rented a room, organized a Sunday-school, and sought admission to the homes of the people. At first they distrusted and repelled her; but finally, as noiselessly as a sunbeam, she entered every door and left it ajar. She performed every possible office; she laid a bunch of flowers at the bedside of the sick; she tied the folded ribbon around the hands of the dead baby; and by-and-by the people warmed toward her, and instead of repelling they invited and welcomed her. She was offended at nothing. On Christmas eve one of the scholars of her school, one rude fellow, brought a common brick wrapped again and again in rolls of paper. It was nothing but a common brick, and of course the laugh was on her. She was not offended. She laid that brick before her among her household treasures; she thanked him for his kind gift and won his heart. A professor in one of the conservatories of music, when she was gathering funds for her mission, sent for her and said: "I do not believe in your God, your Bible, or your religion, but I value your services to my people. I believe in you." And socialists, men and women, would say to her, "Whatever may happen in this city, you shall not be harmed."

O my brothers, what the world wants today is not more of our masterly controversies and dogmatism, but what the world is sighing for is the sweet, the persuasive, self-forgetting ministry of loving women. When I see all about me these consecrated women treading the alleys of our great cities, protected by their simple guilelessness, climbing into the attics, exploring the dark cellars, that they may bear to the poor and unregarded the sweet blessings of the gospel of Christ, it seems to me out of our stormy griefs a ladder is lifted skyward with the angels of God ascending and descending thereon.

CHURCH ETIQUETTE.

From *The Cumberland Presbyterian* (Nashville, Tenn.), November 12, 1891.

The editor of the *Sunday-school Times* recently asked Robert J. Burdette to reply to the inquiry of a correspondent who wished a "few points on church etiquette." His reply is in a characteristic vein:

The next time your journey leaves you stranded in the great and delightful city of New Chicorkadelphia on the Sabbath day, if you should go to the church of Saint Indolence—I can recommend it as having the slowest singing, and the softest pew cushions, with a preacher to match, in the city —you will see the following "Suggestions to Worshippers:"

"Fall or slide into the pew nearest the aisle.

"Stay there.

"Do not sit erect, but lop. Rest one elbow on the arm of the pew, and support the side of the face with the outspread hand. If the cheek can be pushed up in folds and wrinkles, so as to wholly or partially close one eye, all intelligent expression will be destroyed, and the attitude of utter and disrespectful laziness will be heightened by the charm of imbecility or natural stupidity.

"Do not rise during the singing of the hymns. The fact that you played tennis or base-ball all Saturday afternoon, or walked four or five miles around a billiard table Saturday night, entitles you to a little rest Sabbath morning. This is the day of rest, and you are no Sabbath-breaker.

"Take advantage of the long prayer, when other people should have their eyes closed and their heads bowed, to adjust yourself into a position of limp and lounging listlessness, that you can endure comfortably through the sermon.

"Extend your legs as far under the pew in front of you as you can make them reach without sliding off your seat.

"Gracefully and politely cover your mouth with your hand while yawning during the sermon. If the minister is looking at you, cover the mouth with both hands, and, at the close of the yawn, bring your jaws together with a cheerful snap.

"It is a mark of the highest culture and best breeding in refined society to look at your watch frequently during the service. After looking at your watch, always turn your head and gaze longingly and earnestly toward the door.

"Do not move if a stranger, accompanied by his wife and daughter, attempts to enter your pew. Permit them to climb over your legs, no matter how much it may annoy you. This is the Lord's house, and all his children are welcome. It is not Christian, and it may even be questioned if it is really polite, to put your knees up against the back of the pew when a family of strangers attempt to enter. It is practised in some churches, but we have never openly encouraged it here.

"Do not annoy strangers who may enter the church by looking at them, or even glancing in their direction. Nothing is more embarrassing to a sensitive person than to find himself an object of attention, under the eyes of strangers in a strange place. If he really wants a seat, he will find one without the obtrusive interference of other people. Some of the ablest scholars in our denomination believe the employment of ushers to be a relic of paganism and a legacy of Romanism, if, indeed, they are not the Scarlet Woman himself.

"At the close of service remark aloud, but to yourself, that you are as hungry as a shark, and set off for home at a brisk trot. The house of the Lord is no place for idle chatter and worldly gossip with strangers."

He then describes the imposing edifice of the "church of Saint Dives of Giltedge" and its methods.

"But last of all, it may be by some mistake you stumble into the church of the Samaritans. You have no dealings with these fellows, and you would back out as soon as you see where you are going; but the Samaritans are wide awake, with some very informal notions about church etiquette. The sexton, standing on the porch, sees you are a stranger, and the minute you pause hesitatingly in front of the church you are his. He hypnotizes you with a cheerful nod and a beckoning hand, and passes you on through the wide-open door almost before you know it. An old deacon in the vestibule has you by the hand at once, and introduces you to 'our church clerk,' adding, as he reaches your part of the introduction, 'I don't exactly know your name'—as though he used to know it like a book, and has a pretty good inkling of it now, but can't quite place you. An usher at each door is ready for you—there is a perfect picket-line of sextons and deacons and ushers along the front of the church of the Samaritans; not to keep people out, but to bring them in; it isn't a fort, it's a hospital; it's a man-trap, baited with Christian courtesy, and the man who is caught there never tries to get away. The older you are the better seat you get; if you hint to the young fellow that is leading you forward that your hearing is a little 'near-sighted,' he'll get you the best seat in the house, if he has to ask a resident Samaritan to give it up to you. You get comfortably seated, and somebody pushes a hassock toward you; a child in the next pew hands you a hymn-book; an old lady puts a Bible into your hands. The minister looks at you as though he had seen you before, and was glad to see you again.

"Before you get fairly out of the pew, after service, somebody has you by the hand, telling you he is glad to see you there, the pastor is asking you to come again, the usher is telling you the hour of evening service, the superintendent is giving you an invitation to stay to Sabbath-school, and when, a little ashamed of the way you tried to back out, you say, rather meekly, you are a member of the Church of Jerusalem yourself, they say, reassuringly, ‘ O that's all right ; there isn't much difference between the Samaritans and the Church of Jerusalem now ; lots of your people drop in and see us on their way to Jericho ;' the deacon tells you ‘ he got the best wife in the world out of the Church of Jerusalem ;' and so you have a good time, and go away with such a glow at your heart that, if it wasn't Sabbath, and in town, you'd take off your coat.

“ You see, it is just here ; the Samaritans feel at home in their church, and consequently they know just how to make strangers feel at home there. It is their Father's house, and they conduct themselves there as easily, cordially, naturally, as children at home. A church of that sort has a home-like atmosphere the visitor recognizes and enjoys. Any guest can tell the family living room from the ‘ spare-room ' with his eyes shut. The trouble with some of our churches is that the members frequent them so seldom they have a cat-in-a-strange-garrety feeling themselves when they do go, and are consequently awkward and constrained in their efforts to make the stranger feel welcome—very much as I should probably act if, being a chance visitor at the palace, I should attempt to receive Queen Victoria's guests in the drawing-room, while she finished her luncheon of bread and honey in the kitchen.

“ Get acquainted in your own church ; feel at home there yourself ; get into the habit of frequenting the house during the week ; and on Sabbath attend both services and the Sabbath-school—see how easily the ‘ workers ' of the hive and the little people receive and entertain guests—and you will soon find yourself as cordial and warm-hearted as those fellows over in the church of the Samaritans, and won't ask for a letter of introduction and countersigned credentials before passing a hymn-book to a stranger. And remember always the injunction of Peter, ‘ an apostle of Jesus Christ,' writing ‘ to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia ' —‘ Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous.' ”

TRUTHS AND HALF-TRUTHS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE P. FISHER, LL.D.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, November 19, 1891.

THE world is misled by half-truths. No truth stands by itself. The assertion of a truth is liable to convey, if not by necessary implication at least by natural suggestion, an error, if there be silence respecting the truth which forms its counterpart and so converts the hemisphere into the globe. If it had been barely affirmed by Copernicus that the sun stands still, and had he not at the same time taught that the earth moves in an orbit round the sun, he would have brought in more confusion than light. No religion is totally false. Mohammedanism proclaims a great truth—the dominion in the world of an almighty will. The creed of Islam is mischievous, not in virtue of what it thus declares, but on account of that which it ignores. There is no type of theology calling itself Christian which is wholly erroneous. Few sermons are delivered in which there is not a positive inculcation of something that is true. But if you are to judge of the value of the sermon you must take into the account the things that are left out or called in question. There will be reactions in theology. An undue emphasis in one place gives occasion to an undue emphasis in another. So the integrity of Christian doctrine is broken. The symmetry of Christian truth is sacrificed to the detriment of the congregations who listen to pulpit instruction.

Leaving these generalities, I will illustrate them by a reference—I wish it did not need to be so brief—to certain tendencies just now more or less prevalent.

We hear a great deal said, in churches regarded as “ Evangelical,” of the fatherhood of God. Now there is a *natural* fatherhood of God in relation to men. It is a precious truth. He is even said to be the “ Father of Lights” ; that is, He creates, and His energy sustains, the heavenly bodies. More than this is true of His relation to men. We are made in His image. As the apostle Paul teaches, quoting heathen poets, we are “ the offspring of God.” Like Him we are spiritual beings. It is probable that Luke, in the genealogy which he gives of Jesus, designates Adam as a son of God. It is right to dwell on this indestructible relation of the soul to the divine Creator, Preserver and patient, merciful Benefactor. But leaving out passages which are misinterpreted, the verses of Scripture that touch on the natural fatherhood of God, important as that truth is, can be counted on the fingers of one hand. The passage which speaks of Him as “ the God and Father of all” refers, as the context shows, to Christian believers. The “ children of God” in the Old Testament and the New are those who do His will and are like Him. The “ children of God” are distinguished from the world at large. “ As many as received

Him [Christ], to them He gave power [the right] to become the sons of God, even to them who believe on His name." They *become* children by believing on Jesus. So writes the apostle John. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." "Ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." "And if children, then heirs," etc. So writes the apostle Paul. The teaching of Jesus is to the same effect. The peacemakers are blessed, "for they"—*they*, not people of a different mind—"shall be called the children of God." Christ bade His hearers do good to their enemies, "that ye may be the children of your Father"; that is to say, be like Him.

The Lord's Prayer was given to disciples. In the early church it was used in worship only in assemblies of disciples. In keeping with this use of terms, Christ said to a class of wicked men, "Ye are of your father, the devil;" "ye do the deeds of your father." If the parable of the prodigal son implies the *natural* fatherhood of God, it must not be taken as in the least inconsistent with the ordinary doctrine of the New Testament as to the *moral* fatherhood. The design of that parable was to teach one thing—the joy in heaven over a repentant sinner. To use it to prop up other beliefs—for example, the denial of the atonement, or of the need of conversion in order to become a child of God in the deeper sense—is to misuse it. Through all the Scriptures, in the Old Testament and in the New, God is represented as having a people separate morally and spiritually from the world. That people in the New Testament is composed of the true followers of Christ. They it is who are God's children. To cast aside this fundamental part of the New Testament teaching is to mutilate the gospel.

Let me give another illustration. There have been times when the direct bearing of the life and work of Christ on men has been allowed to retreat into the background. Attention has been concentrated on the immediate relation of what was done and suffered by Christ to God and to His character and administration. It was assumed by some preachers that it was enough to hold up the Saviour as a makeweight in a theological system. A certain amount of suffering was required to meet an exigency in the moral government of the world, and this was furnished by the crucifixion. But now the pendulum swings to the opposite extreme. If the atonement, in the historical and correct sense of the term, is not distinctly denied, it is not seldom practically left out of sight. Attention is directed exclusively to the manward influence of Christ, to His merciful teaching and the persuasive power of His death, apart from any atoning efficacy that inheres in it. No other significance is attached to His death beyond its agency in winning men from the practice of sin. I have nothing to say here of particular theories concerning the atonement. Just how it brings in reconciliation, as being the ground of the forgiveness of sin, is a question which possibly admits of no more than a partial solution. Whatever may be the "mysterious obstacles"—to use a phrase which I lately met with in a letter of Archbishop Tait—to the exercise of the divine compassion in the pardon of sin, such obstacles really exist unless we are prepared to reject the unequivocal testimony of the Scriptures. This cardinal truth of a great reparation in behalf of mankind is imbedded in the teaching of the Bible. It has entered as a vital element into Christian experiences in all ages. It pervades the hymns and the prayers of the church from the apostolic days until now. It is involved essentially in the Eucharist. The fundamental fact has been well expressed by my friend, Dr. R. W. Dale, in an excellent sermon at the opening of Mansfield College. The relation of mankind to God is determined by the relation of Christ to Him. Such is the substance of Dr. Dale's remark, if it is not his precise language. The opposite interpretation—the Socinian interpretation of the Scriptures on this subject—is exploded on the field of scientific interpretation. It is discarded by Baur and other critics, who have no liking for orthodox doctrine, yet on this topic are quite free from dogmatic prepossessions. I can think of no German commentator of any respectability, of whatever school, who does not sanction for substance the Evangelical interpretation of the teaching of the New Testament on this theme.

The passages in the Scriptures that speak of the reconciliation of God to the world (with the *possible* exception of Col. 1 : 20) all signify, as the context clearly indicates, not a change in the attitude of the world in reference to God, but a change in His relations to the world, a change, however, of which He is the ultimate author. Yet we not unfrequently meet—where we should not look for it—with the abandonment of the Evangelical and the adoption of the Socinian exegesis. If history is worth anything as a witness, the result of such a step, wherever it is taken, will be to deprive the gospel of an essential element of its power over the consciences and hearts of men. A half-truth cannot be made to do the work of the truth.

There is space for one other illustration of the remarks made above on the danger of half-truths. It is connected with the doctrine of retribution. No doubt it is a gain to be rid of a certain hard and harsh way of presenting this truth. No doubt a disproportionate prominence was once given in the pulpit to this side of Christian truth. The motive of fear was often plied in such a manner and in such a degree that the sweeter, more attractive influences of the gospel were not allowed their due place. An overshadowing dread repelled many from coming to God, and eclipsed the revelation of His love. Punishment was conceived of as an external infliction, if not as a literal furnace of fire, and hell as a vast torture-chamber.

But now comes the reaction. Not a few preachers are almost silent respecting the penalties here and hereafter of unrighteousness. The fears which lurk in the human conscience are soothed by methods different from those prescribed in the New Testament. It is evident that Christ and the apostles considered that there is a rational ground for fear. "I will forewarn you," said Jesus, "whom ye shall fear." There was peril, great and imminent. There was a doom to be escaped. The laws of character are pronounced to be laws of nature. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Much is said of the possible loss of the soul. When Paul preaches, Felix trembles. There is a gospel of grace, of pardon and purification, but evidently no gospel of good-nature and easy-going indulgence. These "elemental fears" in the human soul are not to be narcotized. That kind of preaching which deals with them as if they did not exist, or, at least, had no right to be, will never permanently command the attention of men. It will never be a "power" unto salvation. There may be a momentary attraction of novelty. Literary finish or graceful oratory may draw hearers for awhile, but the interest will die out. Imagine the great preachers of the church, from Paul to Augustine, from Augustine to Bernard, from Bernard to Luther, from Luther to Wesley, from Wesley to Chalmers, to have discoursed in the fashion of which I am speaking, to have prophesied only "smooth things." Would their names ever have been heard of? No; what men need for the malady of which they are more or less conscious, but which they are often indisposed to look into, is a faithful diagnosis and a proportionately thorough remedy. "Behold the goodness *and the severity* of God." The last words of the injunction are not to be erased. Besides the appeal to the affections, there must be an address to the conscience.

There is progress in theology. We are learning, or ought to be learning, something every day. We are escaping from errors, we are acquiring new truth. But this progress is not revolutionary. The great lines of theology are not to be drawn anew. Whatever may be true in any "new theology"—and for one I am ready to receive whatever is true—there is no "new theology" worthy of the name that has the effect to undo the teaching of the past in its fundamental character. If the knowledge gained to-day were to sweep away the knowledge we had yesterday, then we might expect that to-morrow would abolish our present beliefs. Absolute skepticism would be the logical consequence. But those who are over-zealous for innovation seldom look forward to such a result. They appear to think that they are speaking the last word, and that they mark the boundary between a past which is all darkness and a future which is all light. There is now a prevailing interest in Biblical criticism. It is plain to the discerning that the old doctrine of inspiration will have to be formulated anew. So much the more is it requisite in this period of partial unsettlement to keep a firm hold of the truths which enter into the warp and woof of Scripture and to which the church has borne witness from a living experience of their reality.

A STORY ABOUT MR. GLADSTONE.

In the life of Sir James Picton just published, the following occurs, related on the authority of J. Allanson Picton, M. P., the writer of the Life:—"Mr. Henry Pooley [Sir James' father-in-law], during one of the early 'teens of the century, went to do some smith's work at the house of Sir John Gladstone. One of the children—Master William by name—became interested, and stood watching him. After a while, the child looked up at him with eager eyes and said, 'Mr. Pooley, do you love Jesus?' The delight of the Methodist may be imagined. He lived to hear of his infant evangelist as member for Newark, and author of 'The State in its Relations to the Church.' The religiousness characteristic of the statesman was manifest in the child."—*The British Weekly.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Prophecies of Jeremiah. With a Sketch of his Life and Times. By the Rev. C. J. Ball, M A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. (The Expositor's Bible.) New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1890. 8vo, pp. vi., 424, $1.50.

This volume comprises expository lectures upon the first twenty chapters of Jeremiah. The only suggestion of a continuation of the work is furnished by occasional incidental references to comments upon later chapters, which are not included in this volume.

Without preface or introduction the author begins at once the sketch of Jeremiah's life and times, to which he devotes 57 of his 424 pages. Information as to the prophet's "life" is so largely derived from his writings, and his "times" are so intimately involved in the exposition of his prophecies, that all might well have been left for discussion with the prophecies themselves. In this chapter some of the author's faults appear at once. He is more controversial than the plan of the Expositor's Bible would seem to demand; he appears to delight to show his predecessors wrong, even in questions which he confesses to be immaterial. In order to picture the prophet's life with all possible vividness and detail, he occasionally overestimates the value of merely critical conjectures. For example, adopting seemingly the view of his favorite authority, Hitzig, that Jeremiah was the author of certain Psalms, he enriches his sketch with inferences drawn from them.

But these are only minor defects, far less noticeable in the following chapters, and less prominent, be it thankfully said, in this work than in most modern commentaries. The age is too critical; a writer feels uncomfortable to hold an opinion without overthrowing every other conflicting view.

Our author takes up the chapters of the prophecy in groups, nearly in the order of their occurrence, the basis of grouping being continuity of discourse or similarity of subject. He translates, but not completely or always literally; he intersperses paraphrases, and interrupts quotations and exposition with matter belonging to text criticism. Indeed, in trying to avoid foot-notes—and we thank him for it—he sometimes spoils a page; however, his English is elegant, when uninterrupted, and it offers easy and charming reading.

As intimated, he follows Hitzig in many respects, differing from him often, but plainly drawing largely from him. He holds the composite character of the Hexateuch, wonders if there are any who hold the obsolete and unintelligent theory of verbal inspiration, makes numerous verbal changes in the text, often with the authority of the LXX., but sometimes without, and in many other ways unhesitatingly indicates his attitude toward the questions of Old Testament criticism. There is much strictly exegetical matter in the volume, but its strength lies in its freer treatment of the main thought and purpose of the prophecies, and in the restatement of them in terms that make them applicable to our own times.

One of the richest chapters is that entitled Popular and True Religion, in which he discusses Jer. vii.–x. He dwells at length upon the relation of the Hebrew prophets to the ritual. Taking viii. 9 not (vi. 10 !) as his text, he writes vehemently against the folly of maintaining the scientific accuracy of the Bible, because of the utter irrelevancy of the matter; even to raise such a preposterous question, he says, is to be guilty of a crude anachronism and to betray an incredible ignorance of the value of the Scriptures. "The Bible is an unique repertory of moral and religious truths," and these truths are self-attesting to minds able to realize them. The earnestness of Jeremiah's charge against his countrymen is almost outdone by the vigor of the author's similar charges against Christianity in his own land and day.

Another fine passage given us out of his royal bounty is that in which, commenting upon the last verses of Chapter xv., he argues from the universal instinct of prayer, the existence of an object of prayer, of a God.

Without singling out other sections and without entering into critical questions, for they are foreign to the main purpose of the book, suffice it to say, that it is exceedingly interesting and as profitable as interesting, full of suggestion and inspiration, and all the more valuable because in it criticism allies itself with older scholarship in the search for spiritual truth, and in admiration of it when found.

Owen H. Gates.

Union Theological Seminary.

Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament. Dritter Band. Abtheil. I. Briefe an die Kolosser, Epheser, Philemon. Die Pastoralbriefe. Bearbeitet von H. von Soden. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr; New York: Gustav Stechert, 1891. 8vo, pp. vii., 255, 4.50 marks.

This review will simply state the results of Von Soden's investigations regarding the introduction to those New Testament writings which are treated in the third volume of the Hand-Commentar.

Von Soden strongly maintains the genuineness of the Epistle to the Colossians. He shows the weakness of the literary argument which has been so often used against the Pauline authorship. The content also of the Epistle is held to be Pauline, though it has certain peculiarities. It is recognized that the particular form of false teaching in Colossæ accounts for the particular form in which Christological and other doctrine is presented.

This false teaching was analogous to the doctrine of the "weak" in the Church at Rome. It was Jewish in origin, though not connected with Essenism. It was ethical rather than religious. Its chief departure from sound doctrine was its denial of the completeness of Christ's work. Especially with reference to the universe of matter and the angelic world Christ's work was incomplete, hence the necessity of such ceremonies as the false teachers sought to bring in.

It is held that the Epistle was written in Rome rather than in Cæsarea, and was written before Philippians.

Its great historical importance appears notably in this fact that it shows how Paul, while in prison, was regarded as authority even in distant regions where he had not labored, and also in this, that it gives the first sketch of Christian ethics.

Regarding the Epistle to the Ephesians, Von Soden holds that it was not a circular letter for the churches of Asia Minor, but a catholic writing. Against the commonly accepted theory that it was a circular letter, it is urged, among other things, that we should then expect to find some trace of one of the various addresses.

The Pauline authorship is rejected. Considerable stress is laid in this connection upon the literary argument. The style is said to be that of a phlegmatic man, while a choleric temperament is manifest in the Pauline Epistles; but more importance is attached to the differences in thought which are said to exist between this writing and those which are known to belong to Paul. It is said that the Epistle to the Ephesians does not recognize the difference between Jew and Gentile which the Pauline letters show. It teaches also that the Jews are children of wrath, contrary to Gal. ii. 15. It teaches that the significance of the law consisted in the fact that it brought enmity between Jew and Gentile, and that the Jews had no superiority on account of it. Its conception of the Gentiles too is un Pauline, for it teaches that they are without God, atheists. Further, it is said that we can scarcely conceive of Paul as writing an abstract letter. All his writings are in the highest degree concrete and specific. Another point in which Ephesians differs from the Pauline Epistles is the idea of the Church. Individual churches, such as appear in the genuine writings of Paul, disappear here behind the Church. Again, the Epistle to the Ephesians lays little stress on the atonement, and then not for individuals, as is the case with Paul, but as that which has done away with the enmity of the law. There is nothing in the Epistle regarding the Parousia, as that with and by which the consummation of the kingdom comes.

The conclusion of the author is that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written by a pupil of Paul, a Jew of the Diaspora.

The pastoral epistles also are not attributed to Paul. The occasion of putting the thoughts in the form of pastoral letters may well have been some epistolary communications of Paul. Such genuine fragments or documents may be found in 2 Tim. i. 15–18, iv. 6, 9–22, but apart from these the letters are from an unknown hand or unknown hands. The earliest date for the composition of 2 Timothy is the time of Domitian ; 1 Timothy and Titus would then belong to the first decades of the second century. The lines of argument by which these conclusions are supported are mainly those which have often been advanced. There is no place in the life of Paul for the relations presupposed in the epistles. The polemic against false teachers shows no trace of the question whether the Old Testament law was binding for Christians, which question dominated the Pauline period. A college of presbyters, whose duty was to preserve the tradition and to look after the morals and discipline of the Church, was unknown in Paul's day. In the pastoral epistles the "doctrine" takes the place, in a large measure, of the living Christ as the norm for Christian life. The author of the epistles is thought to have been a man who was at home in the Greek world, but who stood remote from Judaism. George H. Gilbert.

Chicago Theological Seminary.

The Gospel According to St. Luke. (Expositor's Bible.) By the Rev. Henry Burton, M.A. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1891, 12mo, $1.50.

In such a series of interpretations as the Bible Expositor aims to give, the expounders of the gospels have had to face the difficult task of so accomplishing the work as to avoid a detailed "Life of Christ" on one side, and, on the other, a detailed commentary. To so grasp the salient points and present them in connected exposition as to give one an adequate conception of the Gospel is not easy. In part Mr. Burton has succeeded admirably ; in part he has so obscured his work by superabundant rhetoric that one sighs for straightforward prose to tell us what Luke really did intend. The opening chapters are peculiarly exposed to this criticism. Mr. Burton's poetic diction runs away with him. It certainly is no small thing that the apostle in his opening verses calls especial attention to the fact that he is to write down the facts for Theophilus accurately and in *order*. This consideration receives little attention in Mr. Burton's introduction or in the body of the work. The chapter on the temptation, while good, will not bear favorable comparison with a like chapter in Gibson's Matthew. Here and there are passages of rare beauty, indicative of fine insight and appreciation. Such are the estimate of John found in the chapter "The Voice in the Wilderness," and the really fine exposition Concerning Prayer in Chapter XI. Two noteworthy chapters are those on the "Ethics of the Gospel" and the "Eschatology of the Gospel." We could wish that the whole book might have the level of these chapters or that in the parable of the sower. The great fault of the work is the want of sober statement. Power it has, but this needs balance. J. S. Riggs.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. By R. V. Foster, D.D., Professor in the Cumberland University Theological School, Lebanon, Tenn. Nashville, Tenn.: Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House, 1891. 8vo, pp. viii., 414, cloth.

This "handy commentary," based on King James' Version, is "intended chiefly for those readers who, in all churches, will ever be the majority." Hence it is without all learned apparatus, giving simply the results of the investigations of its author, but this, as a rule, in a sufficiently thorough manner. The first sixty-four pages contain an "Introduction" in three chapters. The first chapter treats of *Paul* (before his conversion ; his conversion ; after his conversion) ; the second, of the *Epistle to the Romans* (date ; authenticity ; Church at Rome ; occasion and origin ; style ; leading thoughts, words, texts ; testimonies) ; the third, of the *Teachings of the Epistle* (line of thought ; Paul's doctrine of salvation ; ethical teaching). Chapters I. and II. are lucid and, upon the whole, sober and circumspect ; p. 12, perhaps, does not do full justice to the biblical accounts of the *miraculous* character of Paul's conversion. Chapter III., in our judgment, is not always sufficiently accurate and discriminating. Justification and sanctification, *e.g.*, are not distinguished as they ought to be (pp. 53, 60 ; comp. also pp. 35 sq., 135) ; we should, of course, not *separate* them, but we must carefully distinguish between them. *Qui bene distinguit, bene docet.* P. 50 repeatedly represents Christ as having, by his propitiation, "rendered it morally possible for God—not to *be* propitious toward us—but to *manifest* his propitiousness toward us by offering us pardon ;" "for He was always and intrinsically propitious"—a misleading statement that is fortunately corrected on p. 138 by calling "intrinsic propitiousness" "simply love." Nor can we look upon the explanation of "some of the leading words in the epistle," pp. 35 sqq., as entirely satisfactory. Are, *e.g.*, "righteousness" and "justification" really "represented by the *same* word in the Greek"? Does Paul "*not* mean that God's righteousness or Christ-righteousness (sic !) *is imputed to us* in the sense that we are really not righteousness"?

As regards the commentary itself (pp. 65–414) we could point out many an excellent exposition, excellent both in contents and in form. The great majority of explanations, indeed, cannot but meet with our unqualified approval. Of the well-known *cruces interpretum* we will mention only the following: VII. 14 sqq. is understood of "the *regenerated* man;" VIII. 28 sqq. teaches predestination *in view of foreseen faith;* IX. 1 sqq. does *not* teach *absolute* election. All this, in our opinion, correctly. The interpretation of V. 12, however, incorrectly denies that Adam's posterity sinned *in* and *through* him; and that of VI. 3, that baptism is more than an "outward rite" or "symbol." In explaining III. 25 (p. 141) the question, "If it had been possible for a man to be of a humble and contrite spirit, hating the sin of which he is possessed, independently of any such proof of God's righteousness, either in promise or actually, would it have been possible for him to find acceptance with God?" is answered *affirmatively;* "but it would have been a matter of pure trust on his part"—a supposition without any scriptural foundation. For we can be saved only *in the name* of Jesus Christ—*i.e.*, by the *revelation* of him and his vicarious, atoning work apprehended by faith (Acts iv. 12).

The make-up of the book as to paper, printing, and binding is very good; the arrangement of the contents is all that a reader could desire. Of misprints, however, there is a goodly number, very often in technical terms—*e.g.*, on pp. 7 (mits*o*ah, for mits*v*ah), 34 (anac*a*lutha), 137 and 140 (hilast*a*rion), 271 (san*o*' for san*e*'), 26, 33, 35, 64, 270. On p. 36 an unintelligible sentence no doubt owes this its character to a misprint.

F. W. STELLHORN.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, O.

THE MINOR PROPHETS. By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. (Men of the Bible Series.) New York: Randolph, 1890. 12mo, cloth, pp. viii., 245, $1.

Canon Farrar's works on "The Early Days of Christianity," "Life and Work of St. Paul," "Life of Christ," etc., by the many indications to be found in them of a wide knowledge of Hebrew thought and custom and history, prepare one to look for a good popular and appreciative treatment of any historical or semi-historical subject to which he may give his attention. The author is one of the few men who can speak on many subjects and always speak well. He can hardly lay claim to our attention in the field of the Old Testament as one who claims it for his native heath, especially in the discussion of the more abstruse and strictly linguistic questions. These, however, are for the most part avoided. The author has not aimed at producing a commentary, but at giving a clear exposition of the leading ideas of each book, and this, in the judgment of the present writer, he has done admirably. There is no preface to the book. The first chapter discusses the general characteristics of Hebrew prophecy. The "modern popular usage" which makes the word prophet to mean predominantly one who *foretells* the future, one who could "predict events which could be known to him only by miraculous revelation," he rejects as wholly inapplicable to the great body of prophetic teaching. "The definite announcement of events yet distant is but a small, a subordinate, and an unessential part of the prophet's mission." The attempts to declare the issues of the future belonged rather to the priests, with their Urim and Thummim, which would not have become obsolescent unless it had fallen into suspicion and contempt. The prophet is "an interpreter" of the mind and will of God. Their burdens and oracles and their denunciations of their own countrymen "are based on the unchangeable verities of the divine government." "They were always fulfilled in the spirit, and in the general idea, because they were founded upon moral certainties; but in the letter and in minor details they are not insisted on," nor were they always in these minor particulars literally fulfilled. The author in this treatment of his subject is definite and positive, but his views, though neither new nor uncommon, will not find ready acceptance with the more conservative class. The author has presented approximately the view of prophecy which is most generally accepted by modern scholars. It is noteworthy that out of the twenty-three works cited in the bibliography bearing upon this subject, *fourteen* have been written since 1870, and the half of that number in the last decade. The second chapter deals with the writings of the prophets, treats of their fragmentariness, subsequent publication, and the use made of the minor prophets in the New Testament.

In the chronological arrangement Amos is placed before Hosea, and following Merx, "Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger," Joel is assigned to the period of Nehemiah about 445. In this it would seem that the arguments for the earlier and later dates were about equally balanced. The earlier date has, however, the support of Schrader, Delitzsch, Hitzig, Ewald, and others who follow Credner, who wrote in 1831.

The same method of treatment is carried through all the books. First a brief sketch of the writer's life is given, the political situation of the kingdoms is sketched, the moral and religious life of the people, princes, and prophets portrayed, and then in a following chapter the prophecy is dealt with as to its subject-matter. In the writer's view this is ably done. The great teachings of the prophet are seized upon with fine spiritual insight and set forth in strong and vigorous language.

Taken altogether, this little work is to be commended as one of the most helpful of books on the minor prophets. It will prove especially helpful to theological students and Bible-class teachers, and the interested layman will find in its reading a new conception of the work of the prophets, as servants of Jehovah and preachers of righteousness.

J. A. CRAIG.

OBERLIN, O.

OVERCOMING THE WORLD AND OTHER SERMONS. By the late EDWIN HATCH, D.D., sometime Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Purleigh. With Biographical Notices, Edited by his Brother. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1891. 8vo, pp. xlii., 336, $1.50.

A striking portrait of Dr. Hatch is prefixed to this volume. Any one who regards it carefully cannot fail to discern in it the face of a great man, for indeed he was a great man—one of the strongest, deepest, truest souls these times have seen. He was a Broad Churchman in the true sense of that much abused phrase. There are only two kinds of Churchmen—the *broad* ones and the *narrow* ones. The former asks with regard to all questions, "What is the truth?" the latter asks, "What ought I to believe?" The constant vice of the latter is that he assumes belief to be under the control of the will. When, therefore, Dr. Hatch approached the question of "The Organization of the Christian Churches" with the single purpose to find out as an historian what the facts really were, the narrow men fell foul of him as one who assumed the right to believe in the premises things which they assumed that a Churchman had no right to believe. Because of this absolute mental freedom, combined with his marvellous learning and sagacity, we do not hesitate to write him down as the head of all those who have written Church history in the English tongue. This position the great Dr. Harnack assigns him, and, we think, rightly.

But it is the mark of the Broad Churchman that he tries to sympathize with, or at least to understand the mind of those who disagree with him. This trait is pre-eminent in the volume of sermons now before us. They are for the most part sermons delivered before university men, though a few of them are addressed to simple folk; but let them be addressed to whom they will, their distinctive mark is *honesty*—moral and intellectual *honesty*. He wants to know what is the very truth concerning God and man, and the Church, and the vexed questions which distract us. It does not weigh with him that various portions of truth seem to be inconsistent with each other. He has no preadopted symmetrical "system" to defend. He knows that it is the law of God's universe that absolute truth is composed not by the fusion, but the comprehension of opposites in one stable whole. What he pleads mightily for is the spirit which was also in Christ—the spirit which is able to know what it is able to bear, and to allow that there is much which it is not able to bear now. No mistake could be greater than to imagine that this temper produces vagueness or confusion in the teaching of the great man. We do not know anywhere more perfect models of intellectual lucidity than these sermons. But, after all, it is the noble spirit of the man in them which tells. We would that at least three of them might be read and digested by every preacher living. They are those upon "Diversity in Unity the Law of Spiritual Life," "Humility in Theology," and "Individualism and Ecclesiasticism." Every candid and fair-minded man who reads them will agree with all his heart with the opinions expressed in the preface to this book by the London *Times*, by the Bishop of St. Albans, by such men as Dr. Sanday, Canon Hare, Canon Driver, Principal Fairbairn, and Professor Cheyne, that in the death of Dr. Hatch not only the Church of England but the Church Catholic has lost one of its very greatest and noblest men.

S. D. McConnell.

Philadelphia.

What Rome Teaches. By M. F. Cusack (the Nun of Kenmare). New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1891. Cloth, 12mo, pp. 280, $1.25.

It is well known that the author of this book is one of the Anglicans the Oxford movement carried to Rome, who, after more or less tribulation, have found the way back. But, though naturally tinged with her experiences, the book is not a repetition of any previous account of them. It is what it professes to be, a popular statement of the actual teachings of the Roman Catholic Church to-day. Miss Cusack, however, seems to have written under the depressing influence of a conviction that her testimony will not be heeded, and perhaps even suspected as being no more worthy of credence than much which the world has heard before from ex-Romanists of unsavory repute. This is greatly to be regretted, for her laudable purpose would have been better served if she could have written with less perturbation of mind. Complaints of Protestant indifference and accusations of culpable neglect to minister the Gospel to the Romanist multitudes are not the best means of gaining attention, and they are too frequent in these pages. Notwithstanding that we have entire confidence in her sincerity, and admit that her exposition of Roman Catholic doctrine is supported by pertinent quotations from authoritative statements of doctrine, we fear the book, as a whole, only too well illustrates what Miss Cusack herself says about the weaknesses besetting most Protestant attacks on Rome. There is generally a failure to recognize the deep eternal truths which underlie Rome's teaching and ritual, and in which Mariolatry and other pernicious practices are rooted. Moreover, in her revulsion from the evils of Romanism, the author seems to have committed herself to an extreme Protestant view of the Church and the Sacraments. This can scarcely fail to weaken the effect of what is strong and well put in her main argument, except, indeed, with those who agree with her in that view.

Merchantville, N. J. R. G. Moses.

A Decade of Christian Endeavor, 1881–1891. By Rev. Dwight M. Pratt, Pastor Williston Church, Portland, Me. Introduction by Rev. Wayland Hoyt, D.D., Pastor First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minn. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co. Pp. xviii., 177, $1.

It is characteristic of great religious movements that they take their rise in the thought of some man who is himself ignorant of the significance of his own idea. The successive impulses which have made Christianity great have come from men who had no thought of the significance of their words or acts. The so-called Christian Endeavor movement is one of the most remarkable of the many religious movements which characterize this century. The quiet pastor who elaborated in the Portland parsonage an organization for the young people of his parish little dreamed that he was inaugurating a religious movement of world-wide significance. Yet the organization there perfected, from a local society, became a great institution; and from an institution became an interdenominational movement.

The growth of this society has been phenomenal. Starting only a decade ago, it numbers at the present time over a million adherents, and has already planted its standard on every continent and in the islands of the sea. The society grew out of a need felt by all earnest pastors for a larger activity among the young people of the Church. Its principles are very simple, and yet very comprehensive. The fundamental idea is a covenant of personal loyalty to Christ, and a covenant of a special service in a weekly prayer-meeting. It was at first supposed that this definite covenant would render the society slow of growth; but it was soon evident that the loyalty of the young people had been underestimated, for the covenant has become the most popular element of the society. The organization of the membership of the society into various committees for the prosecution of church work gave to the young people what they had long needed, an opening for specific and well-directed activity. As was intimated, the originator of this movement, Rev. Francis E. Clark, then of the Williston Congregational Church, Portland, Me., thought only of organizing and directing the activities of the young people of his own parish; but as the movement spread and was eagerly taken up by the young people of different churches, it soon became apparent that the Christian Endeavor idea was adapted not alone to the churches of one denomination, but of all denominations. And hence, a third important element of this great movement of young people is its spirit of interdenominationalism. Indeed, this latter spirit has come to be almost the war cry of the hosts of Christian Endeavor, and at their monster conventions no word provokes such hearty applause, and no idea appears more constantly than just this interdenominationalism.

The modest volume before us condenses into the brief limit of less than two hundred pages a short history of the first decade of Christian Endeavor, and a statement of its underlying principles and controlling purpose. The author is the successor of Dr. Clark in the Williston church in Portland, and writes as an enthusiast thoroughly in love with his subject. The book is a careful, accurate, and, so far as may be, an authoritative statement of the aims, spirit, and achievements of one of the most significant religious movements of modern times. Those who are in sympathy with Christian Endeavor will be glad to read it because of its accurate setting forth of the principles of their work; those who are not in sympathy with Christian Endeavor should read the book, that they may become informed as to the magnificent progress of a society which is doing more to vitalize the faith of the young and to break down the barriers of a narrow sectarianism than any organization now in existence. F. A. HOLMAN.

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.

MECHANISM AND PERSONALITY. An Outline of Philosophy in the Light of the Latest Scientific Research. By FRANCIS A. SHOUP, D.D., Professor of Analytic Physics, University of the South. Boston: Ginn & Company. Pp. 334. 12mo. $1.30.

In his preface Professor Shoup gives us the genesis of this work in the words: "The need of something to meet the growing inquiry as to what becomes of metaphysics in the glare of the scientific thought of the day impressed itself upon the author, and he conceived the idea of trying what he could do in the way of outlining an answer. These pages are the result of this effort." As his guiding principle in the execution of this work, he quotes the statement of Professor Huxley: "The reconciliation of physics and metaphysics lies . . . in the confession by physics that all the phenomena of nature are, in their ultimate analysis, known to us only as facts of consciousness; in the admission by metaphysics, that the facts of consciousness are, practically, interpretable only by the methods and formulæ of physics."

Such a plan necessarily calls for a pretty full statement of the established facts of science, especially in the department of what the author calls Psycho-mechanism. This he gives us in the first eight chapters of his book. With the execution of this part of his work we have been especially pleased. In terms readily understood by the non-professional reader, Professor Shoup states with great fairness the latest results of modern scientific investigation, carefully distinguishing between established facts and mere speculation and conjecture.

In the execution of his work the author is led to treat of matters which have engaged the attention of the ablest thinkers of ancient as well as modern times. Many of these he has carefully studied, and having arrived at definite conclusions satisfactory to himself, he gives the reader the benefit of his study in terms positive and easily understood. As specimens of this we quote his conclusions respecting

1. *Personality, as applied to man.* "What are we to understand by the *ego*, the *me*, the *self?* First, negatively (speaking for myself), I do not mean the body, nor the brain, nor any special organ of the body—I do not mean the memory, nor imagination, understanding, will, or consciousness, nor even what is commonly called mind or soul. I do mean all these—the whole self—all that goes to make up what we know as *person*—in one sense compounded of parts, in another and higher sense, absolutely partless—a unit, not susceptible of any sort of fraction or division. We see in it a living exemplification of the problem about which philosophy, ancient and modern, has ever busied itself—the co-existence of the 'one and the many.' As 'many,' it is composed of two chief factors—a marvellous mechanism and an incomprehensible and dominant psychical energy; as 'one,' it is a living and ineffable personality. The nature and existence of the mechanism and the psychic factor are known only through the personality which for each and every one of us is the one primordial and necessary fact of the universe" (pp. 9, 10).

2. *Of Personality as predicated of God*, the author writes: "So long as men know that 'good' is, so long they must know that God is. Good, in its only right sense, presupposes, and is inconceivable apart from Personality; and Personality, in its highest term, is God. The only indisputable fact of the universe for every man, we repeat for the last time, is Personality. In the moment of direct scepticism, the consciousness of doubt carries with it the farther and higher consciousness of self, as a necessary and precedent fact; and unless one can arrive at such a stupendous egoism as to hold one's self to be the sole and only reality, subsisting in a sublime isolation of circumambient nothingness, one must know that there are other personalities out of and beyond our own; and that the universe is meaningless and inconsequent, except under the postulate of an Infinite and Absolute Personality—God over all" (p. 333).

3. One other of the author's conclusions, briefly stated, is all that space permits us on the present occasion: "The religious element is not educated into man, though it may be developed and informed; but when it is absent—if that can ever be—it has been educated out of him. This is abundantly shown by the history of races and individuals." GEORGE D. ARMSTRONG.

NORFOLK, VA.

BRIEF REVIEWS, BY THE EDITOR.

The volume which has gone to its one hundred and fortieth thousand in order to get into its second edition does not need any further commendation from any one. Now and then a critic may complain, but the popular judgment has been pronounced and from that there is no appeal. Such a book is *Our Country; its Possible Future and its Present Crisis*, by the Rev. *Josiah Strong*, D.D., General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States. Having been first published in 1886 for the American Home Missionary Society, it is now issued in a new, enlarged, and largely rewritten form for the same society by the Baker & Taylor Co., New York (1891, 12mo, pp. 275, paper, 30cents; cloth, 60 cents). In this edition the material of the census of 1890 has been used as far as it was available. For renewed usefulness this was obviously essential. A book so widely read has also had the benefit of varied criticism, and the author has profited thereby in some places. He has also attempted to meet the objections of his Romish readers, and to give his citations of papal documents, for instance, in authentic form. Explanatory notes have been added where needed; a new chapter on "Religion in the Public Schools" has been written, and everything done to add to the value of the book. It only remains to say that the patriotic American cannot afford to miss the reading of this wonderful book, stored with facts which have an immediate bearing upon the welfare of this land. For the benefit of any possible person who may not have seen this volume in its earlier edition, the chapter headings are subjoined: Introduction, by Austin Phelps; I. The Time Factor in the Problem; II. National Resources; III. Western Supremacy; IV. Perils: Immigration; V. Romanism; VI. Religion and the Public Schools; VII. Mormonism; VIII. Intemperance; IX. Socialism; X. Wealth; XI. The City; XII. The Influence of Early Settlers; XIII. The Exhaustion of the Public Lands; XIV. The Anglo-Saxon and the World's Future; XV. Money and the Kingdom. The author regards the outlook to-day as more favorable than it was five years ago, mainly on account of the awakened condition of those by whom these various perils have been appreciated and weighed, but the situation still calls for action, not relaxation of effort. The estimate of Professor Phelps is worthy of reproduction: "This is a powerful book. It needs no introduction from other sources than its own. Its great strength lies in its facts. These are collated with rare skill. . . . The book will speak for itself to every man who cares enough for the welfare of our country to read it, and who has intelligence enough to take in its portentous story."

Hebrew Lexicography is shortly to have two important additions. Progress in this department is marked by a succession of monuments in the form of dictionaries. The latest editions of Gesenius by Mühlau and Volck have not been entirely satisfactory. The new work under the general editorship of Professor Francis Brown promises to be most scholarly and satisfactory. It will retain the names of both Gesenius and Robinson, though it will be almost absolutely a new and original work. We hope to give shortly a review of the "first part" from a thoroughly competent hand. The latest addition in the field is the *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, bearbeitet von Dr. *Carl Siegfried* (of Jena) und Dr. *Bernhard Stade* (of Giessen). The primary intent of this volume is that it may be useful to theologians who study the Bible for the sake of its contents, not for Orientalists whose interest is purely philological. Comparative philology and etymology are subordinated, while vocabulary and usage are emphasized. The completion of the work is expected early in 1892. (Part I., pp. 1–480, 8vo, 15 marks.)

A Sketch-Book of the American Episcopate, by the Rev. *Hermon Griswold Batterson*, D.D. Third edition. Revised and enlarged. With appendix. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 389, xxx., $1.) Dr. Batterson has earned the renewed thanks of all those who may have occasion to refer to the leading facts in the lives of the first one hundred and fifty-six bishops of the American Episcopal Church, and who desire the information in compact form. Only those who have undertaken similar work can begin to appreciate the amount of careful and painstaking toil which is here represented. The volume is one of reference mainly, and it would probably be impossible to find the same information in any one library in the land. There can be no doubt that the book will "find a place among works of historic record which are valued by students and men of letters." Besides the sketches of American bishops there are a brief account of the Episcopate in Scotland, with papers relative thereto, and also to the consecration of Bishops White and Provoost, sketches of the Church in Haiti and in Mexico, a list of clergy elected to the Episcopate who declined or were not confirmed, and a list of "Archbishops." Of the latter Dr. Batterson says, "As we have the *thing*, why be frightened at the *name?*"

Longmans, Green & Co. (London and New York) have recently issued a little volume of thirty-five pages by *Edward Jonathan Birch*, M.A., Rector of Overstone and Honorary Canon of Peterborough, entitled *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* according to the teaching of the primitive Church and of Anglican divines. The quotations presented are all very brief and all very much to the point. They are intended as a short statement of some of the proofs that the Patristic and the early Anglican view was the usual Protestant view; that in the sacrament we have a symbol of the presence of Christ, and that in the falling of the doctrine of Real Presence the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharist necessarily falls too. The sacrifice hinges on the real presence, and if that be not allowed the Romish Mass becomes simply idolatry.

An Inquiry into the Nature of Our Lord's Knowledge as Man, by *W. S. Swayne*, M.A., Oxon., Clerk in Holy Orders, Theological Lecturer and Diocesan Preacher in the Diocese of Lichfield. With a preface by the Bishop of Salisbury. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. xxx., 55.) A great and important subject is here treated briefly. The current of opinion is traced from the early fathers down to recent times by way of quotation and brief remark. In this way the little volume will be useful. The biblical statements express both the perfect humanity and the deity of Christ. Schools of thought have emphasized each at the expense of the other and have so run into heresy. The combination of both is a mystery in which we are met by the question whether a limitation of the human knowledge of our Lord implies in any degree that He was fallible as man. This query is answered in the negative. Kenosis is regarded as a self-limitation imposed at the dictate of divine love, which at the same time must be regarded as a self-perfection.

The Greatest Work in the World is the title of a new book by Dr. *Arthur T. Pierson*, which has for its theme "The Evangelization of all Peoples in the Present Century." (New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891, pp. 62, 35 cents.) The well-known missionary enthusiasm and zeal of the author find here renewed expression. In spite of the noble gifts of the churches to the cause of foreign missions, the statement is made that the work goes on so slowly as to justify the accusation that "the Church of God is trifling with human souls and with her own duty," and that "Christian missions have never yet been taken up by the Reformed Church as an enterprise to be dared and done for God with promptness and resoluteness." It is easy enough to figure out the possibilities in the case, but till the churches experience a great awakening the fact is likely to stand that they have nearly reached the proportional limits of their giving.

Family Worship is the title of a little book of sixty-one pages by the Rev. *R. De Witt Mallary*. of Lenox, Mass., published by the Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society. (Boston and Chicago, 1891, 16mo, pp. 61, 15 cents.) While especially adapted to the perusal of clergymen, it is also suited to arouse the attention of laymen to this most important and helpful element in the growth and development of vital piety. It may be unqualifiedly commended to the attention of Christian people of all denominations.

The Drift of the Young Men with Relation to the Churches, by Rev. *C. E. Harrington*, D.D. (Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1890, 16mo, pp. 79, paper.) The author here reproduces the substance of two papers on the subject in hand, giving the facts so far as they were ascertainable from experience and correspondence, the reasons usually alleged for the "drift," and some practical suggestions as to the best methods for its prevention. With some reiteration of things already familiar, the author has combined some forceful and pertinent remarks which make a very respectable contribution to the discussion.

Peace and its Hindrances, by the Right Rev. *Ashton Oxenden*, formerly Bishop of Montreal, is a small vellum-covered volume recently issued. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891, crown 8vo, pp. vi., 54, 35 cents.) The author is too well known to need introduction, and the subject important enough to justify a larger volume. The presentation before us has much of Scripture and many references to the phrases of the Book of Common Prayer. In its simplicity it is calculated to aid many in their growth in grace. The only criticism upon it relates only to the brevity of discussion and the too small amount of attention to that which should have been the main topic. The list of hindrances are those most felt by the plain ordinary Christian.

A little volume recently published by Whittaker (1891, pp. 238, $1.25) will prove to be of special interest to the alumnæ of St. Agnes' School, in Albany. The volume contains twenty *Addresses to the Graduating Classes of St. Agnes School*, all but one of which are by the Right Rev. *William Croswell Doane*, S.T.D., LL.D., Bishop of Albany, who has the honor to have been the founder and constant sponsor for the school. While of special interest to the ever-increasing number of those who look back upon St. Agnes as their school-home, these words of wisdom and strength may be profitably read by members of "graduating classes" elsewhere as well as by those who have not had the privilege of an extended course of study. "The School of St. Agnes," founded twenty (not two, as the preface reads) years ago, was intended to be one "which, while furnishing all that was best in intellectual education and womanly accomplishments, would combine with them religious instruction and training in accordance with the principles of the [Episcopal] Church."

The Right Road, a handbook for parents and teachers, is the title of a volume by *John W. Kramer* (New York: Whittaker, 1891, pp. viii., 282, $1.25), which is intended to present "an elementary treatment of Christian morality." It is divided according to the usual threefold arrangement of duty to self, to others, and to God. One of the main features of the treatment is in the introduction of a considerable number of stories intended to illustrate the subject in hand. These are of various quality and aptness. The text, which is intended for the eye of the parent or teacher, sometimes betrays the fact that the author has had his ultimate audience in view, and occasional sentences are very elementary in their style and tone. Upon the whole the volume will be of service to such instructors as need some systematic scheme by which to guide and regulate their teaching along the lines covered by the author. But the present material will have to be assimilated by the teacher before being used.

QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

The Church Quarterly Review, London, Oct., 1891.

In 1890 the Bishop of Salisbury made an offer at the diocesan synod to assist the publication of a thesis upon the nature and limits of our Blessed Lord's knowledge as man, and the consequence was an essay by W. S. Swayne, M.A., London, 1891, "An Inquiry into the Nature of our Lord's Knowledge as Man." It is on the lines of that essay the opening article of the present number, "Our Lord's Knowledge as Man," discusses the question, demonstrating its intimate connection with several of the principal doctrines of Christianity, especially that of the incarnation. Then follow an interesting sketch of "Archbishop Tait," based on "The Life of Archibald Campbell Tait," by R. Th. Davidson and William Benham, 2 vols., London, 1891, and a less interesting, because not so very striking sketch of "Jenny Lind," on the basis of "Memoir of Madames Jenny Lind-Goldschmidt," by H. Scott Holland and W. S. Rockstro, London, 1891. "The Council of Ephesus" gives some new information, derived from an unpublished Coptic manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, which throws a sharp light upon the inner workings of that famous assembly. The article on "John Wyclif" is a summary, intelligent and clear cut, of the very important contributions to the Wyclif literature which have been made during the last ten years, not only in England, but also in Germany and France. Besides a great wealth of short notices on minor topics, this number also contains essays on "Christianity and Morals," in the form of an appreciative analysis of the "Principles of Natural and Supernatural Morals," by Rev. Henry Hughes, 2 vols., London, 1890; "The County and Diocese of Lincoln;" "The Letters of Keats;" "The Elizabethan Explorers," and "Mozley's Letters from Rome" during the œcumenical Council, 1869–70.

The Presbyterian Quarterly, Richmond, Va., Oct., 1891.

"Calvinism and Confessional Revision," by A. Kuyper, Amsterdam, Holland, is an authorized reprint from *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, and discusses the questions: Has a specific tendency which, like Calvinism, leads to a separate church organization a right to exist in the Church of Christ? What specific tendency does Calvinism represent in this Christian Church? In what manner has this tendency found its expression in the ecclesiastical symbols? and, To what conditions is the revision of these symbols, in the case of a progressive development of Calvinism, to be bound? "The Universal Book," by J. B. Shearer, D.D., LL.D., is a rapid but pointed comparison between the study of literature, such as it now has become—an element of culture—and the study of the literature comprised in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. "The Inspiration of the Scriptures," by John Pym Carter, D.D., Washington, D. C., gives a series of theses encompassing the whole subject in all its various phases. "The Study of the Bible in the Original Languages at the Seminary," by W. M. McPheeters, D.D., considers first the object of such a study, and then the best method of obtaining that object; and "Calvinism and Infant Salvation," by W. L. Nourse, D.D., examines the prevalent idea of Calvinism, more especially in relation to infant baptism.

The Theological Monthly, London, Nov., 1891.

"Professor Huxley and Agnosticism," by Alfred K. Cherrill, examines the relationship of agnosticism to scepticism on the one hand and the faith on the other, more especially that form of the relationship which is represented by Professor Huxley and his rejection of the testimony of the Apostle Paul to the resurrection of our Lord. "Deane's Pseudepigrapha," by P. J. Gloag, D.D., is a review of or—what a commendatory review should never fail to become—an introduction to the recent work by Rev. William J. Deane on those peculiar apocalyptic writings which appeared among the Jews about the commencement of the Christian era. After a sketch of "Matthius Claudius," by R. Shindler, and a vigorous and circumspect exposition of "The Eighty-fourth Psalm," by R. Balgarnie, D.D., there follow an article on the "Ordination in Presbyterian Churches," by Andrew Duncan, and Part II. of "The Bible and Science," by James McCann, D.D., with the subtitle "Matter and its Modes."

The New Englander and Yale Review, New Haven, Nov., 1891.

"The Official Ballot in Elections," by Henry T. Blake, New Haven, Conn., is a searching criticism of the working of the so-called blanket ballot, on basis of well-authenticated facts, and winds up by characterizing it as not in the line of genuine ballot reform, and recommending the official envelope in connection with the retiring booth. In a similar spirit the "Ballot Reform in Pennsylvania," by John Bethell Uhle, Philadelphia, gives a review of the whole process of reforming the ballot in that State. "Ten Volumes of Thoreau," by Joshua W. Caldwell, Knoxville, Tenn., points in the same direction as Lowell's essay, but is stronger or more severe; not so much a piece of delicate criticism, in which every drop of disapprobation is mixed up almost until disappearance in glittering humor, but an outspoken protest against well-analyzed affectations. The emphasis which Mr. Caldwell lays on Thoreau's Buddhism seems well sustained. "President Clap' consists of gleanings from the diary of Rev. Thomas Clap, rector of Yale College one hundred and fifty years ago. "Weeden's Economic and Social History of New England," by William L. Kingsley, is an appreciative and discriminating review of that work.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, Philadelphia, Oct., 1891.

"Eternal Retribution," by Rev. Samuel H. Kellogg, D.D., Toronto, sets forth the reasons which seem to compel the rejection of every form of restorationism, and the acceptance as a fact of the unending retributions of the impenitent in the life to come. "Simon Peter in the School of Christ," by Rev. George T. Purves, D.D., Pittsburg, Pa., is a reconstruction of the spiritual training of the Apostle Peter in accordance with the individual character of his mind and thought. In "Hypothesis and Dogma in the Sciences," corresponding with a former article in the *Review*, April, 1886: "Reason and Revelation in the Sciences," Professor Charles W. Shields, D.D., LL.D., of Princeton College, establishes the following three canons: (1) Hypotheses are to be tested as dogmas within the province of revelation, and dogmas as hypotheses within the province of reason; (2) Hypotheses or dogmas will preponderate in the ascending scale of the sciences according as reason or revelation has primary jurisdiction; (3) Conflicting hypotheses and dogmas can only be adjusted philosophically by ascertaining the problem of opinion. "The New Psychology," by President D. W. Fisher, D.D., LL.D., of Hanover, is a criticism of the so-called *new* psychology, which is principally concerned with the study of the relation between the mind and the brain, so far as it places itself in opposition to the psychology which principally studies the mind in the data of consciousness, and designates it as *old* and *dead*. Then follow "The Prophecies of Balaam," by Rev. Lewis B. Paton, M.A., East Orange, N. J., and "The Vocabulary of the New Testament," by Rev. J. Ritchie Smith, M.A., Peekskill, N. Y., of expository and exegetical interest.

The Andover Review, Boston, Nov., 1891.

The opening article, "The Preaching of the Gospel," by Chr. Van der Veen, D.D., Grand Rapids, Mich., explains the real hardship of preaching the Gospel in its simplicity and purity, without yielding to the demands for modifications from human fear and unbelief. In "Shop-Girls and their Wages," by Professor J. H. Hyslop, Columbia College, New York City, particular stress is laid upon the peculiar competition which exists between working-women and shop-girls, and upon certain half-moral, half-economical conditions which regulate the operations of trade. After "The Education of the Indians," by William Barrows, D.D., and "Recent Progress in Ballot Reform," by Frederick G. Mather, Albany, N. Y., follows "Conservative Apologetics," by Professor E. H. Johnson, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa., which starts from the question: Can apologetics be anything but conservative of faith? and immediately answers, Yes; it may be antiquated.

The Unitarian Review, Boston and London, Nov., 1891.

The present number opens with a review, by Cyrus A. Bartol, of the "Sermons by Frederic Henry Hedge," Boston, 1891, representing his method and style as true expressions of his character as a man. "Mind in Man and Brute," by Professor E. P. Evans, does not enter upon a discussion of the question of human freedom or human necessity, but shows that whatever considerations may be adduced in favor of either hypothesis apply alike to man and to the lower animals. The "Resurrection from the Dead," by A. W. Gould, Manistee, Mich., is a string of delicate ideas—not fancies—from the fact that death in its original form is only the brushing aside of the old and useless material to the faith in the immortality of the soul. "A Call to the Ministry," by Albert Walkley, is a kind of novelette—that is, a moral problem taken up and solved under certain conditions of individual character.

The A. M. E. Church Review (Quarterly), Philadelphia, Oct., 1891.

The opening article, "Bishop Jabez Pott Campbell," is a collection of speeches and memoirs in memory of the late bishop. "The Declaration of Independence and the Race Problem," by Rev. J. C. Embry, D.D., Philadelphia, is principally taken up by an argument, rather well put, against a statement of President Francis A. Walker, in the July number of the *Forum*, that the colored race in America has suffered a constant decline in the ratio of its increase since 1810. "Race Assimilation," by William A. Lynch, M.A., Newark, N. J., takes up the race problem from another point of view, and rejects the idea of a solution through assimilation. "Mathematics in the Public Schools," by Cornelius Smith, Baltimore, Md., and "Education before the Christian Era," by Rev. S. Martin, Alexandria, La., are of practical educational interest, while the article "How is Personal Responsibility to be Reconciled with the Law of Heredity?" by Rev. John P. Sampson, D.D., Asbury Park, N. J., attempts to effect the reconciliation by making the two terms synonymous.

The Methodist Review (Bi-monthly), New York and Cincinnati, Nov.–Dec., 1891.

"The Genesis of the New Testament, with a few Words Concerning Higher Criticism," by Professor L. T. Townsend, S.T.D., Boston University, assumes an attitude toward higher criticism, according to which the latter should be allowed to go quietly about its business, and make what investigations it wants to, as long as it does not undertake to draw any conclusions from such investigations or in any way meddle with the traditional theological view of the genesis of the Bible. "Recent Missionary Discussions," by Bishop J. M Thoburn, D.D., Calcutta, India, is a very ably written survey of those discussions which recently have been taking place in the missionary world, frankly accepting some of the criticism offered, while modifying, correcting, or decidedly rejecting others, but invariably in a spirit of kindness and confidence which is very pleasing. In "Pre-Adamites," beginning with the question "Pre-Adamitism established, can Scripture stand?" Rev. Henry Colman, S.T.D., Beaver Dam, Wis., gives a criticism of Professor Winchell's recently published book, "Pre-Adamites." The number farther contains "Mental and Moral Characteristics of Martin Luther," by Rev. W. N. McElroy, D.D., Springfield, Ill., and "Regeneration as a Force in Reform Moverents," by Rev. C. M. Morse, New Wilmington, Pa.

The Missionary Herald, Boston, Nov., 1891.

The present number contains, besides the "Annual Survey of the Work of the American Board 1890–91," and two papers presented at the annual meeting at Pittsfield, October 14th, on the true and false economy in missions, and on the responsibility of missionary growth by the foreign and home secretaries of the Board, a number of interesting letters of the missions among the Zulus, in Western Turkey, at Madura and Foochow, and in Japan.

The Expositor, London, Nov., 1891.

Of "The Present Position of the Johannean Question," by Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D., Oxford, this number brings the first very instructive and highly interesting instalment, "I. The Tendency of Recent Criticism," showing the gradual convergence of the two lines of criticism which have been followed since the second decade of the present century. The number also contains a lecture on "Samson," his history, character, and position in the Old Testament, by Rev. Professor W. G. Elmslie; "The Aramaic Gospel," by Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, M A., Manchester; and "Uzziah and the Philistines," an argument against Wellhausen, Meyer, etc., by Rev. Professors Marcus Dods, D.D., and W. Sanday, D.D.

The Old and New Testament Student, Hartford, Conn., Nov., 1891.

"Queen Esther; or, The Feast of Lots," by Rev. Thomas Pryde, M.A., Blantyre, Glasgow, is an exposition of Esther iv. 13, 14, and a historical explanation of the Purim feast among the Jews. Then follow new instalments of "The Self-consciousness of Jesus in its Relation to the Messianic Hope," "The Bible in English Life and Letters," and "A Study of New Testament Precedent" (see November number, page 185). "The Literature of the Old Testament Arranged Chronologically" is a formulation of the results of the present scholarly criticism.

The Newbery House Magazine, Nov., 1891.

With reference to the widespread revival of the old practice of confessing before partaking of the Lord's Supper—566 churches in England and 46 in Scotland—Rev. Fr. Black gives in his "Sacramental Confession" a short *résumé* of the grounds on which the revival has taken place, and the principal features of the custom during the earliest centuries. Then follow instalments of articles and contributions of fiction (see November number, page 186), and "The Founder of a Peculiar Sect," by Edith Sellers (see above). "English Monuments and Epitaphs," by Arthur G. Hill., F.S.A., contains much curious information about tombs, effigies, brasses, etc., and so does the "Wells and Well-Worship," by Thomas Anderson.

Good Words, London, Nov., 1891.

Besides new instalments of articles and stories (see November number, page 186), the present number contains a biographical sketch of "David Robertson," the Scotch naturalist, by W. Sinclair; "The Burden of Nineveh," an interesting study on Nahum, by Rev. Professor Kennedy, B.D., University of Aberdeen, and "Algiers," a well-written and well-illustrated travelling sketch by C. Reginald Black. "Numbering the Dust" is a very pleasant and at the same time instructive paper on the golden dust which sometimes becomes visible when dancing in a sunbeam.

Sunday Magazine, London, Nov., 1891.

The present number contains, besides instalments of articles and stories, "A Basket of Summer Fruit," a kind of homily on the vision of Amos, by Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D.D., LL.D.; a biographical sketch, by A. W. W. Dale, of James Gilmour, a missionary to the Mongols on the borders between Siberia and China; "Modern Idolatry," an exposition of Ex. xx. 4, by Archdeacon Farrar, and "Child-painters," by Rev. W. Mann Statham, with special reference to recent pictures of the Academy, of which some illustrations are given.

The Charities Review, New York, Nov. 1891.

The first article of this number—1 of Vol. I.—"What is Charity Organization?" by Robert W. De Forest, President Charity Organization Society of New York, gives a succinct but precise distinction between charity as an individual act and charity organization as a social force, and between the merely beneficent and the generally educating effect to which such a force can be bent. In the other articles of the number, "Arnold Toynbee," by Herbert B. Adams, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University ; "The Baron de Hirsch Fund," by Meyer S. Isaacs, President of Trustees of the Hirsch Fund ; "Municipal Lodging Houses ;" "The Massachusetts Drunkenness Law," etc., the reader will find a fuller exposition of this same idea, considered in its various applications.

The Treasury, New York, Nov., 1891.

The frontispiece gives the portrait of Arcturus Z. Conrad, pastor of the Old South Congregational Church at Worcester, Mass., of whom the number also contains a biography and a sermon—"Heaven." Among its other articles are : "The Sources of American National Life," by Rev. L. A. Banks, D.D., St. John's Church, South Boston ; "The One Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church," by Professor James Heron, D.D. ; a wealth of "Leading Thoughts of Sermons," etc.

CONTENTS OF DECEMBER MAGAZINES.

Harper's Magazine for December has these contents : Frontispiece—*Ecce Ancilla Domini*—from a painting by Dante Gabriel Rossetti in the National Gallery, London ; illustration for "The Annunciation." "The Annunciation," by Henry Van Dyke, with eleven illustrations (including frontispiece) from paintings by Fra Angelico, Andrea del Sarto, Fra Filippo Lippi, Francia, Botticelli, Vander Weyden, and Donatello, from the base-relief by Ghiberti, and from prints from "Das Evangelische Jahrbuch" and Von Lehner's "Marienverehrung in den ersten Jahrhunderten :" The Prelude to the Nativity ; The Story as Told by St. Luke ; Ancient Legends of the Annunciation ; Celebrated Paintings of the Annunciation ; "Mary, Pre-elect God's Virgin." "The Christmas Peal," a poem, by Harriet Prescott Spofford, illustrated by J. R. Weguelin. "A Maid's Choice," a musical pastoral, by W. W. Gilchrist, with eleven illustrations by Howard Pyle." "Chartering a Nation," by Julian Ralph, with seven illustrations by Frederic Remington—some romantic experiences among the Blackfeet Indians : Home Life among the Blackfeet ; Indian Beauty ; A War Dance ; Indians and Medicine ; The Distribution of Rations ; The Pony War Dance, a grand spectacular drama ; A Wonderful Pageant. "My Cousin the Colonel," a story, by Thomas Bailey Aldrich, with five illustrations by C. S. Reinhart. "Measure for Measure," eight illustrations from drawings by Edwin A. Abbey, with comments on the play, by Andrew Lang ; The sixth paper of the superb series of illustrations of Shakespeare's comedies. "At La Glorieuse," a story, by M. E. M. Davis, with eight illustrations by W. T. Smedley ; a story of Louisiana. "Mental Telegraphy," a manuscript with a history, by Mark Twain ; a curious and deeply interesting paper. "Her First Appearance," a story, by Richard Harding Davis. "The Singing Shepherd," a poem, by Annie Fields, illustrated by Alfred Parsons. "A Faded Scapular," a story, by F. D. Millet. "A Walk in Tudor London," by Walter Besant, with ten illustrations from drawings by Harry Fenn and others : A Vision of London Three Hundred Years Ago ; A Ramble with John Stow, the Antiquary ; the Wealth of the City ; The Churches ; Amusements ; How gentlemen Dined in those Days ; Chepe, the Great Business Thoroughfare ; Fashions of the Day ; Theatres ; A Play at the "Globe ;" An Evening at the Falcon Inn. "His Ship," a poem, by James Russell Lowell, illustrated by C. Ricketts. "Melchior. La Messe de Minuit," A Christmas legend, by William McLennan, with four illustrations by C. S. Reinhart ; a story related in the dialect of the French Canadian habitant ; "A Daughter of Heth," full-page illustration drawn by George du Maurier. Editor's Easy Chair, by George William Curtis. Editor's Study, by William Dean Howells. Editor's Drawer, conducted by Charles Dudley Warner.

Scribner's Magazine for December has these contents : "The First Christmas Tree," frontispiece—The Oak of Geismar, drawn by Howard Pyle, engraved by W. M Aikman. "Afloat on the Nile," by E. H. Blashfield and E. W. Blashfield, illustrations by E. H. Blashfield, engraving by Peckwell, Witte, Klotz, C. I. Butler, State, Varley, Heard, and M. J. Whaley. "The Oak of Geismar," by the Rev. Henry Van Dyke, illustrations by Howard Pyle. "Espero Gorgoni, Gondolier," by F. Hopkinson Smith, illustrations by the author, engraving by Pettit, State, Putnam, and Heard. "A Charge for France," by John Heard, Jr., illustrations by L. Marchetti, engraving by Peckwell. "Winter Lilacs," by Mrs. James T. Fields. "A Painter of Beautiful Dreams," by Harold Frederic, illustrations from paintings by Albert Moore, engraving by King, Kruell, French, Wolf, Peckwell, Andrew, and E. H. Del'-Orme. "The Wrecker" (chapters xii.-xiii.), by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne (begun in August—to be continued), with a full-page illustration by William Hole. "Peter Rugg the Bostonian,' by Louise Imogen Guiney, illustrations by Howard Pyle. "A Little Captive Maid," by Sarah Orne Jewitt, illustrations by Herbert Denman, engraving by Witte. "The Land of Poco Tiempo," by Charles F. Lummis, illustrations after photographs, engraving by G. and E. H. Del'Orme. "Peleus to Thetis," by Bessie Chandler, with decorative borders by Herbert Denman. "A Fresh-water Romance," by George A: Hibbard. "Elmwood," in memory of James Russell Lowell, by Thomas Bailey Aldrich. "The Point of View :" The Virtue of Receiving—Mr. Spencer as an Instance—Men's Work.

The Century for December has these contents : "The Holy Family," painted by Frank Vincent du Mond, frontispiece ; "The Christ Child ;" "Raphael" (Italian Old Masters), W. J. Stillman, engravings and notes by T. Cole ; "At First," Amanda T. Jones ; "The Shepherds," Edith M. Thomas ; "The Christmas Shadrach," Frank R. Stockton ; "The Midnight Call," Kate Putnam Osgood ; "The Naulahka"—A Story of West and East, II., Rudyard Kipling and Wolcott Balestier ; "Queen Elizabeth," Rose Terry Cooke ; "The Rapture of Hetty," Mary Hallock Foote ; "The Appearance of the Angel to the Shepherds," painting by P. Lagarde ; "Mozart—after a Hundred Years," Amelia Gere Mason ; "Remembrance," William Sharp ; "The Two Lessons," Thomas W. Higginson ; "A Christmas Fantasy, with a Moral," Thomas Bailey Aldrich ; "The Annunciation to the Shepherds," painted by J. Bastien Lepage ; "The Bowery," Julian Ralph ; "The Long Ago," Julie M. Lippmann ; "Childhood," Viola Roseboro' ; "Holy Night," Painted by Fritz Von Uhde ; "The Ocean from Real Life," John A. Beebe ; "Science and Immortality," Augustus Jay DuBois ; "Sympathy," Charles H. Crandall ; "Frost-Flowers," W. P. Foster ; "The Golden Age of Pastel," Elizabeth W. Champney ; "The Century's Christmas Pictures," Mrs. S Van Rensselaer and W. Lewis Fraser ; "Wulfy : A Waif"—A Christmas Sketch from Life, Vida D. Scudder ; "An Offertory," Mary Mapes Dodge ; "The Song of the Brook," Mary Ainge DeVere ; "Characteristics," I, S. Weir Mitchell ; "Sherman and the San Francisco Vigilantes"—Unpublished Letters, General W. T. Sherman. Topics of the Time : "The Christmas Century ;" "Charitable Reform of High Public Value ;" "The 'Per Capita' Delusion ;" "The World's Columbian Exhibition." Open Letters : "John Boyle O'Reilly as a Poet of Humanity," George Parsons Lathrop ; "The New England Kitchen," Maria Parloa ; "Parks and Playgrounds for Children," Walter Vrooman. In Lighter Vein : "Understood," William B. McVickar ; "Smithy Song," George Horton ; "Jack Frost," Esther B. Tiffany ; "The Blue and the Gray," R. W. P. Noble ; "The Little Tunker Bonnet," B. S. Parker ; "A Parodox," Lydia C. Heckman ; "Friends Only," F. H. Curtiss ; "Embarrassing to a Modest Man," J. K. Bangs ; "Christmas Day," Alice Williams Brotherton ; "To a Southern Girl," James G. Burnett ; "A Christmas Toast," John H. Boner.

Lippincott's Magazine for December has these contents : "A Fair Blockade-Breaker," by T. C. De Leon ; "Negro Superstitions," by Sara M. Handy ; "Undefined," by William H. Hayne ; "Literature in the South since the War," by Thomas Nelson Page ; "An Antique," by R. T. W. Duke, Jr. ; "A Moccasin among the Hobbys," by Richard Malcolm Johnston ; "At a Florist's," by Charles Washington Coleman ; "The Majesty of the Law"—A Talk with Colonel John R. Fellows ;" "On House-Furnishing," by Frances Courtenay Baylor ; "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading artists).

The Atlantic Monthly for December has these contents : "The Chaperon," in two parts : Part second, Henry James ; "Joseph Severn and his Correspondents," William Sharp ; "London and Oxford : Three Sonnets ;" "A Torch Bearer," Harriet Waters Preston and Louise Dodge ; "The Unreported Incident," Harriet Lewis Bradley ; "The Transition in New England Theology," Alexander V. G. Allen ; "The Most Ancient Shrine in Japan," Lafcadio Hearn ; "The Praises of War," Agnes Repplier ; "The Modern Art of Painting in France," Charles H. Moore ; 'Shakespeare's Richard III.," James Russell Lowell ; "American Characters in German Novels," Lida von Krockow ; Recent Dante Literature ; Recent Poetry ; "Mr. James's American on the London Stage ;" Comment on New Books ; The Contributor's Club.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH REVIEW.

Philadelphia, Pa., October, 1891.

Bishop Jabez Pitt Campbell. In memoriam.

The Declaration of Independence and the Race Problem. Rev. J. C. Embry, D.D.

Mathematics in the Public Schools. Cornelius Smith.

The Restoration and Exaltation of Fallen Humanity. T. R. Darrell.

The Negro in the Profession of Law. D. Augustus Straker.

Education before the Christian Era. Rev. S. Martin.

How is Personal Responsibility Reconciled with Heredity? Rev. John P. Sampson, D.D.

Biblical Criticism. Rev. A. W Upshaw.

We are Living in a New Heaven and New Earth. Rev. J. W. Norris.

The Charge Delivered to Rev. T. H. Amos. Rev. H. G. Miller.

Race Assimilation. William A. Lynch, M.A.

The Negro Press in Critique. W. F. Fouvielle.

What is the Best Manner of Conducting Revivals? S. B. Jones.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, November, 1891.

The Preaching of the Cross. Christian van der Veen, D.D.

Shop-Girls and their Wages. Prof. J. H. Hyslop.

The Education of the Indians. W. Barrows, D.D.

Recent Progress in Ballot Reform. Mr. Frederic G. Mather.

Conservative Apologetics. Prof. E. H. Johnson.

Editorial. The New York Presbytery and Professor Briggs. The Limits of Liberty: A Bishop's Charge to his Clergy President Patton's recovered address on Future Probation, with brief annotations.

THE CHARITIES REVIEW.

New York, November, 1891.

What is Charity Organization? Robert W. DeForest.

Labor Organization as Affected by Law. Mrs. C. R. Lowell.

Arnold Toynbee. Herbert B. Adams, Ph.D.

Municipal Lodging Houses. Albert Shaw.

The Massachusetts Drunkenness Law. Warren F. Spalding.

The Baron de Hirsch Fund. Meyer S. Isaacs.

The Prevention of Pauperism. Edward E. Hale.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, November, 1891.

The Present Position of the Johannean Question. I. The Tendency of Recent Criticism. Rev. Prof. W. Sanday, D.D.

The Human Splendours, Our Lord's Third Temptation. W. W. Peyton.

Samson.

The late Rev. Prof. W. G. Elmslie, D.D.

The Aramaic Gospel. Indications of Translation. Rev. Prof. J. T. Marshall, M.A.

Uzziah and the Philistines. Rev. Prof. J. F. McCurdy, D.D.

The Roman Reckoning of the Day. Rev. Prof. Marcus Dods, D.D., and W. Sanday, D.D.

Old Testament Notes. Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

London, October, 1891.

Our Lord's Knowledge as Man.

Archbishop Tait.

Jenny Lind.

The Council of Ephesus.

John Wyclif.

Christianity and Morals.

The County and Diocese of Lincoln.

The Letters of Keats.

A Publisher and his Friends.

Mozley's Letters from Rome.

Elizabethan Explorers.

GOOD WORDS.

London, November, 1891.

The Marriage of Elinor (chaps. xli.–xliv.). Mrs. Oliphant.

David Robertson. W. Sinclair.

The Burden of Nineveh. Rev. Prof. Kennedy, B.D.

Algiers. C. Reginald Black.

Numbering the Dust. Dr J. G. McPherson, F. R. S. E.

Cowper and his Localities (conclusion). Rev. Canon Benham, B D.

Time-Expired Men. Rev. E. J. Hardy, M.A.

A Sprig of Lavender. A. M. Cameron.

The Scarecrow. Geoffrey Winterwood.

The Battle of the Books. Mr. Boyd Carpenter.

How Long? Sarah Doudney.

The Little Minister (chaps. xxxix.–xlii.). J. M. Barrie.

The Christian Life. Rev. A. Orrock Johnston, M.A.

METHODIST REVIEW.

New York and Cincinnati, November-December, 1891.

The Genesis of the New Testament, with a few Words respecting Higher Criticism. Prof. L. T. Townsend, S.T.D.

Recent Missionary Discussions. Bishop J. M. Thoburn, D.D.

Pantheism and Cognition. Prof. C. M. Moss, Ph.D.

Pre-Adamites. Rev. Henry Colman, S.T.D.

Pronouns. Rev. Henry Graham. D D.

Mental and Moral Characteristics of Martin Luther. Rev. W. N. McElroy, D D.

Regeneration as a Force in Reform Movements. Rev. C. M. Morse.

THE MISSIONARY HERALD.

Boston, November, 1891.

Forty Years among the Zulus.

The Life and Letters of Joseph Hardy Neesima.

Mrs. Charlotte H. Chandler, of the Madura Mission. Sec. N. G. Clark, D.D.

Annual Survey of the Work of the American Board, 1890–91.

True and False Economy in Missions. Sec. N. G. Clark, D.D.

The Responsibility Resulting from Missionary Growth and Enlargement. Sec. E. K. Alden, D.D.

The Cry of the Pagan World. Sec. Judson Smith, D.D.

Letters from the Missions.

THE NEWBERY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, November, 1891.

Sacramental Confession. Rev. Fr. Black.

Church Progress in America. Thomas B. Preston.

Historical Churches of England. V. The Temple Church. Rev. H. Hayman, D.D.

The Paris Press and the Paris Poor. Edmund R. Spearman.

"No Compromise" (chaps. xvi.–xvii.). By Helen F. Hetherington and Rev. H. Darwin Burton, M.A.

A Genius. Alan Adair.

The Founder of a Peculiar Sect. Edith Sellers.

Our Monthly Review. IV. Rev. R Linklater, D.D.

Salmstone Grange. Edgar Pickering.

Wells and Well Worship. Thomas Anderson.

The Driver of the Mail. Frederic E. Weatherly.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW

November, 1891.

The Official Ballot Elections. Henry T. Blake.

Ballot Reform in Pennsylvania. John Bethell Uhle.

Tonic Autumn.

The Sea Gull's Song.

Ten Volumes of Thoreau. Joshua W. Caldwell.

Ye Mystic Mayd.

President Clap.

Weeden's Economic and Social History of New England. William L. Kingsley.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., November, 1891.

Editorial

Queen Esther; or, The Feast of Lots. Rev. Thomas Pryde.

The Self-Consciousness of Jesus in its Relation to the Messianic Hope. II. Rev. Albert W. Hitchcock.

The Bible in English Life and Letters. II. Rev. J. T. McClure, D.D.

A Study of New Testament Precedent. III. Rev. Augustine S. Carman.

The Gospel of John. William R. Harper and George S. Goodspeed.

The Literature of the Old Testament Arranged Chronologically.

THE SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

London, November, 1891.

Godiva Durleigh (chaps. xxxvii.–xl.). Sarah Doudney.

A Basket of Summer Fruit. Hugh Macmillan, LL.D.

Pleasant Memories of Ceylon. C. F. Gordon-Cumming.

Christ's Hospital and its Sons (conclusion). Rev. E. H. Pearce, M.D.

Pris: A Story of Rural Life (chaps. i.–ii.). By the author of "Zoe" etc.

James Gilmour. N. W. W. Dale.

Lago di Garda. William C. Preston.

Modern Idolatry. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D.

Child-painters. Rev. W. Mann Statham.

The Power of Jesus. Rev. B. Waugh.

THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

London, November, 1891.

Professor Huxley and Agnosticism. A. K. Cherrill.

Deane's Pseudepigrapha. Paton J. Gloag, D.D.

Matthius Claudius. R. Shindler.

The Eighty-Fourth Psalm. R. Balgarmie, D.D.

Ordination in Presbyterian Churches. A. Duncan.

The Bible and Science. James McCann, D.D.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD.

New York, December, 1891.

The Foreign Mission Day at Northfield Convention.
Misses Louise B. and Anna W. Pierson.
The Sacred Land of Palestine.
Mrs. David Baron.
European Literature in the Mission Fields.
F. F. Ellinwood, D.D.
The Evangelization of Israel.
Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph.D.
Some Polemical Writings against the Jews in the First Seven Centuries.
Rev. B. Pick, Ph.D.
The Tour of the Lantern. A Letter to Young Folks. F. E. Hoskins.
Jerusalem's Crying Wants.
Rabbi A. Ben-Oliel.
Extracts and Translations from Foreign Periodicals. Rev. C. C. Starbuck.

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW.

Boston and London, November, 1891.

Sermons by Frederic Henry Hedge.
Cyrus A. Bartol.
Salutary Asceticism. W. H.
Mind in Man and Brute.
Prof. E. P. Evans.
Resurrection from the Dead.
A. W. Gould.
A Call to the Ministry.
Albert Walkley.

THE TREASURY.

New York, November, 1891.

Sermons. Rev. A. Z. Conrad, Ph.D.
E. Y. Robinson, D.D.
Thanksgiving Day Service.
Louis Albert Banks, D.D.
J. G. Mason, D.D.
Living Issues. Prof. James Heron, D.D.
Leading Thoughts of Sermons.
Pen-Pictures of Eminent Preachers.
Old Testament Inspiration.
The Science of Preaching.
Archdeacon Farrar.
Sunday-School Cause.
Alfred H. Moment, D.D.
Helpful Hints for Workers.
J. E. Denton.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Alberti Magni Ratisbonensis Episcopi opera omnia. Ex editione Lugdunensi religiose castigata, et pro auctoritatibus ad fidem vulgatæ versionis accuratiorumque Patrologiæ textuum revocata, auctaque Alberti vita ac bibliographia operum a Pères Quétif et Echard exaratis, etiam revisa et locupletata cura ac labore Augusti Borgnet, annuente faventeque pontifice maximo Leone XIII. 4 vol. Vol. VII.–X. Vol. VII., Ethicorum, Lib. X. Vol. VIII., Politicorum. Lib. VIII. Vol. IX., Parvorum naturalium, pars prima. Vol. X., Parvorum naturalium, pars altera. Paris: Vivés, 1891. Pp. 694, 696, 707, 860, 8vo.

Ali, Syed Ameer. The Life and Teachings of Mohammed; or, The Spirit of Islam. London: Allen, 1891. Pp. 676, 8vo, 18s.

Ancient Fathers on the Office and Work of the Priesthood in the Church of Christ. Being an English translation of a principal portion of a work published under the title of "Du Sacerdoce," by a Director of the Seminary, in Latin and French (Paris: Vives, 1857), and dedicated to Edward Lord Bishop of Lincoln. London: Skeffington, 1891. Pp. 162, p. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Andrews, W. Curiosities of the Church. Studies of curious customs, services and records. 2d ed. Hull: Andrews, 1891. Pp. 212, 8vo, 6s.

Arnot, William, D.D. The Church in the House. Lessons in the Acts of the Apostles. New York: Tibbals, 1891. Pp. 464, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Bachmann, Joh., Dr. Präparationen zu den kleinen Propheten. 5. Heft: Maleachi. Analyse, Uebersetzung, Dispositionen. Berlin: Mayer, 1891. Pp. 27, 8vo, 60 pf. (Hefte 1–6, 4 mk.)

Bachmann, J. Präparation und Kommentar zu den Psalmen mit genauen Analysen und getreuer Uebersetzung, für Gymnasiasten, Studirenden und Candidaten herausgegeben 4. Heft. Ps. lxxiii.–lxxxix. Berlin: Schneider, 1891. Pp. 263–337, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Banks, Louis Albert, D.D. White Slaves; or, The Oppression of the Worthy Poor. Boston: Lee, 1891. Pp. iv., 327, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Baring-Gould, S. The Church in Germany. With maps. London: Gardner, 1891. Pp. 416, p. 8vo, 6s.

Barron, L. La Raison et la Foi. Solution des deux grand problèmes qui ont pour but de concilier la foi avec la raison et la raison avec la foi. 3e fascicule. Lagny: Colin, 1891. Pp. 254, 8vo. (Fasc. 1–3, 8 fr.)

Batut, Antoine. Vie du père—, religieux de la Compagnie de Jésus, ancien missionaire au Maduré et directeur de l'Ecole apostolique de Bordeaux. Toulouse: Loubens, 1891. Pp. 423, 16mo.

Baumgarten, Michael, Prof., Dr. Ein aus 45jähriger Erfahrung geschöpfter biographischer Beitrag zur Kirchenfrage. Als handschriftlicher Nachlass herausgegeben von H. H. Studt. Kiel: Homann, 1891. Pp. x., 335; iii., 277, 8vo, 10 mk.

Berry, T. S. Christianity and Buddhism: a comparison and a contrast: being the Donellan Lectures for the year 1889–90. London: S. P. C. K., 1891. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Bixby, James Thompson. The Crisis in Morals. An examination of rational ethics in the light of modern science. Boston: Roberts, 1891. Pp. ii., 315, 16mo, cloth, $1.00.

Bligh, E. V. Lord Ebury as a Church Reformer. With selections from his speeches and letters, and copious appendix. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 384, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Boyden, P. M., Rev. The Churchman's Answer Why. New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 46, 16mo, paper, 10 cts.

Buhl, F. Jesaja, oversat og fortolket. 7de Hefte. Kjobenhavn: Gyldendal, 1891. Pp. 96, 8vo, 1.50 kr.

Burrell, David J., Rev., D.D., and Jos. Dunn, Rev. Hints and Helps on the Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1891. Pp. 463, 8vo, $1.25.

But How—If the Gospels are Historic? An apology for believing in Christianism. By the author of "If the Gospel Narratives are Mythical—What then?" Edinburgh: Macniven, 1891. Pp. 196, p. 8vo, 5s.

Carter, Robert: His Life and Work, 1807–1889. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. viii., 250. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Chapman, Charles. Pre organic Evolution and the Biblical Idea of God. An exposition and a criticism. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. xii., 304, 12mo, cloth, 1891, $2.40.

Charron, Pierre. A Treatise on Wisdom Paraphrased by Myrtilla H. N. Daly. With introduction by Marcus Benjamin. New York: Putnams, 1891. Pp. xxvi., 199, 16mo, cloth, $1.25.

Chenoweth, C. Van D., Mrs. Stories of the Saints. New ed. Boston: Houghton, 1891. Pp. iii., 162, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Chrystal, James, M. A. Authoritative Christianity. The first œcumenical council—that is, the first council of the whole Christian world, which was held A.D. 325 at Nicæa in Bithynia. Vol. I. Which contains all its undisputed remains in Greek and English; the English translation. (Vol. I. of "Authoritative Christianity."—The decisions of the six sole œcumenical councils—that is, the only decisions of the whole Church. East and West, before its decision in the ninth century.) Jersey City: the Author, 1891. Pp. xvi., 483. 8vo, $4.00. (The series, $3.00 per volume by subscription.)

Church Work in North China. Being a sketch of the Church of England. Mission in North China. together with an account of the formation of the diocese. With a preface by Right Rev. C. P. Scott, Bishop of North China. With map and illustrations. London: S. P. C. K., 1891. 12mo, 1s.

Collet, P. La démonologie de Jésus Christ. Thèse. Montauban: Granie, 1891. Pp. 58, 8vo.

Conn, H. W. The Living World. Whence it Came and Whither it is Drifting. A review of the speculations concerning the origin and significance of life and of the facts known in regard to its development, with suggestions as to the direction in which the development is now tending. New York: Putnams, 1891. Pp. v., 195, 8vo, $1 25.

Cooke, R J., D.D. Christianity and Childhood; or, The Relation of Children to the Church. Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. ii., 230, 12mo, cloth, 90 cts.

Cornelius, C. A. Kristna Kyrkans historia. VIII. delen: Det nittonde århundradets kyrkohistoria. Upsala: Schultz, 1891. Pp. iv., 204, 8vo, 2.75 kr.

Cramer, J. Exegetica et critica II. Het glossematisch Karakter van 1 Pet. iii., 19–21 en iv., 6. Utrecht: Breijer, 1891. Pp. 73–149, 8vo. (Niewe Bijdragen op het gebied van godgeleerdheid en wijsbegeerte. Deel VII., Stuk 4.)

Crusius, G. Concept einer aristokratischen Philosophie, Religion und Ethik. Leipzig: Wigand, 1891. Pp. 62, 8vo, 1 mk.

Dale, R. W. Fellowship with Christ, and Other Discourses delivered on Special Occasions. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 370, 8vo, 6s.

Daniell, G. W. Bishop Wilberforce. London: Methuen, 1891. Pp. 220, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d. ("English Leaders of Religion" series.)

Denis, P., Abbé. Léon XIII. et dom Pothier. Etudes sur la question actuelle du chant liturgique. Paris: Haton, 1891. Pp. 104, 8vo.

Dewart, Edward Hartley, D.D. Jesus the Messiah in Prophecy and Fulfilment. A review and refutation of the negative theory of Messianic prophecy. Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. 256, 12mo, cloth, 90 cts.

Dickie, John. Words of Faith, Hope, and Love from the Chamber of a Dying Saint. Being a series of letters, written by the late—, of Irvine, Scotland, during his last illness, to his friend and brother in Christ, James Todd, Dublin. London: Partridge, 1891. Pp. 356, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Didon, Father. Jesus Christ. (Translated from the French.) 2 vols. London: Paul, 1891. Pp. 720, cr. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Dieterich, Albrecht, Dr. Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des späteren Alterthums. Festschrift, Hermann Usener zur Feier seiner 25jährigen Lehrthätigkeit an der Bonner Universität dargebracht vom klassisch-philologischen Verein zu Bonn. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891. Pp. vi., 221, 8vo, 4.40 mk.

Drane, Augusta Theodosia (ed.). The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne. With selections from his letters. New York: Cath. Pub. Soc. Co., 1891. Pp. viii., 259, 8vo, cloth, $2.00.

Drummond, Henry. Addresses. (The Greatest Thing in the World; Pax Vobiscum; The Changed Life; "First"; How to Learn how.) Philadelphia: Altemus, 1891. Pp. 286, 16mo, cloth, 75 cts. Vellum, $1.25.

Drysdale, A. H., Rev., M.A. The English Presbyterians. A historical handbook of their rise, decline, and revival. London: Presb. Ch. Pub. Off., 1891. Pp. 128, 16mo.

Ellis, James J., Rev. John Wesley. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 228, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Ephrem, Saint. Histoire complète de Joseph. Poème en 12 livres. Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée, enrichie de variantes et d'un discours sur la translation du corps de Joseph par un auteur anonyme, qui a abrégé celui de Banni (Bedjan) (In Syriac.) Paris (Leipzig: Harassowitz), 1891. Pp. xi., 369, 8vo, 10 mk.

Esslinger, R., Pfarrer. Zur Erkenntnisstheorie Ritschls. Eine Studie. Zürich: Schultthess, 1891. Pp. vii., 49, 8vo, 1 mk.

Exell, J. S. The Biblical Illustrator. St. John, Vol. III. (Also) 1 Thessalonians. London: Nisbet, 1891. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Farrar, Frederic W., D.D. Darkness and Dawn; or, Scenes in the Days of Nero. An historic tale. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. x., 594, 8vo, cloth, $2.00.

Ficker, J. Die Konfutation des Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses, ihre erste Gestalt und ihre Geschichte. Leipzig: Barth, 1891. Pp. cxxxviii., 194, 8vo, 10 mk.

Finney, Charles G. Sermons on the Way of Salvation. Oberlin: Goodrich, 1891. Pp. vi., 467, 12mo, $1.50.

Flügel, Ewald. Thomas Carlyle's Moral and Religious Development. A study. From the German by Jessica Gilbert Tyler. New York: Holbrook, 1891. Pp. iii., 140, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Fullarton, Alex. The Indianapolis Letters on Theosophy. A series of letters contributed to the *Sentinel.* New York: The Path, 1891. Pp. 34, 16mo, 10 cts.

Fulton, John, D.D. The Beautiful Land. Palestine, historical, geographical and pictorial, described and illustrated as it was and as it now is along the lines of our Saviour's journeys. Introduction by Henry C. Potter, D.D. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. xii., 652, 4to, cloth, $3.75.

Funcke, Otto. The World of Faith and the Everyday World as Displayed in the Footsteps of Abraham. From the 6th German edition by Sophia Taylor. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. xvi., 354, 8vo, cloth, $3 00.

Funk, Franz Xavier. Die apostolischen Konstitutionen. Eine litterarisch-historische Untersuchung. Rottenburg: Bader, 1891. Pp. vii., 374, 8vo, 6 mk.

Gilman, Nicholas Paine, and Jackson, Edward Payson. Conduct as a Fine Art. The Laws of Daily Conduct, by N. P. Gilman. Character Building, by E. P. Jackson. Boston: Houghton, 1891. Pp. ix., 230, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Goodhart, G. A. The Christian's Inheritance. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 142, 12mo, 1s.

Gore, Charles, M. A. The Incarnation of the Son of God. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1891. New York: Scribner, 1891. Pp. xxi., 295, 8vo, $1 50.

Gossner, J. Die heiligen Schriften des neuen Testamentes mit Erklärungen und Betrachtungen. V. Theil. Die Apostelgeschichte St. Lucä. Neu herausgegeben. Hamburg: Ev. Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. 274, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Griffiths, W. Divine Footprints in the Bible. London: Stock. 1891. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Grundemann, R., D.D. Vater Christliebs Abendunterhaltungen über die Heidenmission. I. Das Missionswesen in der Heimat. Berlin: Müller, 1891. Pp. 66, 12mo, 20 pf.

Güdemann, M. Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Unterrichts und der Erziehung bei den deutschen Juden. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf Mendelssohn. Berlin: Hoffmann, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 324. 8vo, 12 mk.

Guyan, J. M. Education and Heredity. A study of sociology; translated from the 2d edition by W. J. Greenstreet; with introduction by G. F. Stout. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. xxiv., 306, 8vo, cloth, $1.25.

Hähnel, Verhältniss des Glaubens zum Wissen bei Augustin. Programm. Chemnitz, 1891. Pp. 24, 4to.

Harlez, C. de. Les Religions de la Chine. Aperçu historique et critique. Leipzig: Gerhard, 1891. Pp. 271, 8vo, 6 mk.

Harrison, A. J. Problems of Christianity and Scepticism. Lessons from twenty years' experience in the field of Christian evidence. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 340, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Hebblethwaite, J. W. Darkest World Turned into Brightest Glory. London: Christian Commonwealth, 1891. Pp. 312, 8vo. 5s.

Helmore, F. Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Helmore. London: Masters, 1891. Pp. 150, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Herron, George D., Rev. The Larger Christ. Introduction by the Rev. Josiah Strong, D.D. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. ii., 122, 12mo, 75 cts.

History of Calvary Baptist Church, New York. Robert S. MacArthur, D.D., Pastor; Frank R. Morse, D.D., Associate. Illustrated. Prepared under the direction of the officers of the church. New York: Scott, 1891. Pp. 112, 8vo, $3 50.

Hobson, James P., Rev. The Love of Christ: His to us, Ours to Him. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 143, 16mo, cloth, 40 cts.

Hodder, E. Conquests of the Cross. Vol. III. London: Cassell, 1891. 4to, 9s.

Hulme, F. Edward. The History, Principles, and Practice of Symbolism in Christian Art. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 230, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Huntington, William Reed, Rev. The Peace of the Church. Bohlen Lectures for 1891. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 252, p. 8vo, 6s. (Also) Popular Misconceptions of the Episcopal Church. New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 86, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

Hurlbut, Jesse L., D.D., and Doherty, Robert R., D.D. Illustrated Notes. A guide to the study of the Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. New York and Cincinnati: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1892. Pp. 396, 8vo, $1.25.

Hurst, John F., D.D., LL.D. Indika. The country and people of India and Ceylon. With maps and illustrations. New York: Harpers, 1891. Pp. xix., 794, 8vo.

Immerwahr, Walter. Die Kulte und Mythen Arkadiens. In 2 Bänden. 1. Band. Die arkadische Kulte. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891. Pp. vi., 288, 8vo, 4 mk.

Ingram, W. C. Happiness in the Spiritual Life; or, The Secret of the Lord. A series of practical considerations. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 340, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Inspiration and Inerrancy. Inaugural address by C. A. Briggs, together with papers upon Biblical scholarship and inspiration, by L. I. Evans and Henry P. Smith;

and an introduction by Alexander Balmain Bruce. Edinburgh: Clarke, 1891. Pp. 276, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Jennings, W. The Shiking: The Old Poetry Classic of the Chinese. A close metrical translation, with annotations London: Routledge, 1891. Pp. 380, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Johnson, Francis Howe. What is Reality? An inquiry as to the reasonableness of Natural Religion, and the naturalness of Revealed Religion. Boston and New York: Houghton, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 510, 12mo, $2.00.

Kahl, C. Das Werk der Erlösung, das Werk der heiligen Liebe Gottes. Rostock i. M.: Stiller, 1891. Pp. xvii., 374, 8vo, 6 mk.

Kedney, John Steinfort, D.D. Mens Christi and Other Problems in Theology and Christian Ethics. Chicago: Griggs, 1891. Pp. iv., 201, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

King, Georg W. *Κόλασις αἰώνιος*; or, Future Retribution. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. 267, 12mo, $1.00.

Krogh-Tonning, K. Den christelige Dogmatik. II. 1–7de Hefte. III. 1–6 Hefte. IV. 1–2 Hefte. Kristiania: Mallings, 1891. Pp. ii, 447; iv., 410; 160, 8vo, 6.50 kr. + 6 kr. + 2 kr.

Kuntze, J. Die Gotteslehre des Irenæus. Leipzig: Dörffling, 1891. Pp. iii., 71, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Lang, John Marshall, Rev., D.D. Gideon and the Judges. A study, historical and practical. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. xii., 201, 12mo, $1.00.

Laveille, Abbé. L'Eglise institutrice de la France sous la dynastie merovingienne. Coutances: Salettes, 1891. Pp. 69, 8vo.

Leathes, Stanley. The Law in the Prophets. London: Eyre, 1891. Pp. 320, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Le Cannis, E. Origines du Christianisme. L'Oeuvre des Apôtres; "Fondation de l'Église chrétienne," "Période d'affranchissement. Tours: Maine, 1891. Pp. xlviii., 368, 8vo.

Lefevre, André. La Religion. Paris: Hennuyer, 1891. Pp. xli., 587, 18mo, 5 fr.

Lefroy, W. The Christian's Duties and Reponsibilities. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 124, 12mo, 1s.

L'Hillier, A., Père. Saint Thomas de Cantorbéry. Tome 1er. Abbeville: Paillart, 1891. Pp. xii., 469, 8vo.

Lichtenstein, J. Judenthum und Christenthum. Hamburg: Schiebenhuber, 1891. Pp. vii., 97, 8vo, 1.75 mk.

Liddon, H. P. D.D. Sermons: 3d series. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 180, 12mo, cloth, $1.00. (Also) Sermons on Old Testament Subjects. New York: Longmans, 1891. 8vo, cloth. $2.00.

Löwy, A. Catalogue of Hebraica and Judaica in the Library of the Corporation of the City of London. With a Subject Index. London: 1891. Pp. xii, 232, 8vo.

Lyall, A. Natural Religion in India. The Rede Lecture delivered in the Senate House on June 17, 1891. London: Camb. Warehouse, 1891. Pp. 64, 8vo, 1s.

McCosh, James, D.D., LL.D., D.L. The Tests of the Various Kinds of Truth. Being a treatise of applied logic. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. 132, 12mo, $1.00.

Macdonald, Malcolm. Harmony of Ancient History and Chronology of the Egyptians and Jews. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1891. Pp. 301, 8vo, cloth, $2.00.

Macduff, J. R. St. Paul's Song of Songs. A practical exposition of the eighth chapter of Romans. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 222, 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Macfadyen, John Allison. See A. MacKennal.

MacKennal, A. Life of John Allison Macfadyen, first pastor of Charlton Road Congregational Church, Manchester. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 390, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Macleod, N. I. Moral and Religious Anecdotes. Glasgow: Morison, 1891. Pp. 400, 8vo, 6s.

Maimonides' Commentar zum Tractat Kilajim. Zum 1. Male im arabischen Urtext herausgegeben, mit verbesserter hebräischer Uebersetzung und mit Anmerkungen versehen von S. Bamberger. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1891. Pp. 28, 58, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Metzger, G. J., Dr. Die christliche Wahrheit, in ihrem inneren Zusammenhange aus der heiligen Schrift nach Oetingers realistischer Auffassung entwickelt und mit Bezugnahme auf die neuesten theologischen Systeme dargestellt. Stuttgart: Gundert, 1892 (1891). Pp. viii., 328, 8vo, 4.80 mk.

Meyer, J. B. The Psalms. Notes and readings. London: Morgan, 1891. Pp. 306, 32mo, 2s.

Minasi, Ignazio M. La Dottrina del signore pei dodici Apostoli bandita alle Genti, detta la Dottrina dei dodic Apostoli: Roma: Befani, 1891. Pp. lii., 389, 8vo.

Monod, W. Les bases psychologiques du dogme de la rédemption. Thèse. Montauban: Granié, 1891. Pp. 124, 8vo.

Moore, A. L. The Message of the Gospel. Addresses to candidates for ordination and sermons preached chiefly before the University of Oxford. London: Percival, 1891. Pp. 146, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Moses ha Darschan aus Narbonne. Fragmente seiner literarischen Erzeugnisse nach Druckwerken und mehreren Handschriften mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen von Abraham Epstein. (In hebräischer Sprache.) Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. 52, 8vo, 1 mk.

Moule, H. C. G. Secret Prayer. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 143, 24mo, cloth, 40 cts.

Muir, William, Sir, K. C. S. I., LL.D., etc. The Caliphate. Its rise, decline and fall. From original sources. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. xv., 608, 8vo, $4.20.

Neubauer, Adam. Petite grammaire hébraïque provenante de Yemen. Texte arabe, publié d'après les manuscrits connus. Leipzig: Harassowitz, 1891. Pp. 39, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Oppenheim, Bert. Die syrische Bedeutung des 5. Buches der Psalmen (Psalm 107–150) und ihr Verhältniss zu dem massoretischen Texte und den ältesten Uebersetzungen, namentlich den LXX. Targum. Dissertation. Königsberg: Koch, 1891. Pp. 70, 8vo, 1 mk.

Parker, Joseph, D.D. The People's Bible. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. Vol. XV. Isaiah xxvii.–Jeremiah xix. London: Hazell, 1891. Pp. 470, 8vo, 8s.

Patteson, S. R. Gospel Ethnology. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. vii., 224, 12mo, $1.00.

Pentecost, George F. Bible Studies in the Psalms, the Prophets, and the Acts of the Apostles. The International Sunday School Lessons for 1892. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 414, p. 8vo, 4s.

Pfleiderer, Otto, Prof., Dr. Die Entwickelung der protestantischen Theologie in Deutschland seit Kant und in Grossbritannien seit 1825. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. vii., 496, 8vo, 10 mk.

Pfotenhauer, J. P. Die Missionen der Jesuiten in Paraguay. Ein Bild aus der älteren römischen Missionsthätigkeit, zugleich eine Antwort auf die Frage nach dem Werthe römischer Mission, sowie ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Südamerikas. Nach den Quellen zusammengestellt. 2. Theil. Die Reduktionen und das Leben in denselben. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. 223, 8vo, 3.60 mk. (Theile 1 und 2, 7.60 mk.)

Pölzl, Franz X., Prof. Dr. Kurzgefasster Commentar zu den vier heiligen Evangelien. 4. Band: Leidens- und Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu Christi. Graz: Styria, 1892 (1891). Pp. xii., 527, 8vo, 5 mk.

Post, T. A. Truman Marcellus Post, D.D. A biography, personal and literary. Boston and Chicago: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. xx., 507, 8vo, $2.50.

Rawlinson, George, M.A. Ezra and Nehemiah: Their Lives and Times. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. x., 182, 12mo, $1.00.

Regnard, A. Aryens et Sémites. Le Bilan du judaïsme et du christianisme. Paris: Dentu, 1890. Pp. 298, 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Reid, John, Rev. Great Thoughts of the Bible. New York: Ketcham, 1891. Pp. iii, 318, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Rice, Edwin W., D.D. Our Sixty-six Sacred Books: How They Came to us, and what they are. A popular handbook for colleges, Sunday-schools, normal classes, and students, on the origin, authorship, preservation, and divine authority of the Christian Scriptures. Philadelphia and New York: Am. S. S. Un., 1891. Pp. 133, 12mo, 40 cts.

Rice, Henry, Rev. Native Life in India. Being sketches of the social and religious characteristics of the Hindus. Revised. Oakland: Pac. Pr. Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. ix., 160, 12mo, 60 cts.

Richter, Arthur. Erasmus-Studien. Dissertation (zu Dresden). Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. xxiv., 64, 8vo, 2 mk.

Riddervold, J. Matthaei Evangelium, udlagt for Menigheden. 3., omarbeidede oplag. Kristiania: Lund, 1891. Pp. 473, 8vo, 3.20 kr.

Rockhill, William Woodville. The Land of the Lamas. Notes of a journey through China, Mongolia, and Tibet. New York: Century Co., 1891. Pp. viii., 398, 8vo, cloth, $3.50.

Sabatier, A. The Apostle Paul. A sketch of the development of his doctrine. Translated by A. M. Hellier. Edited, with an additional essay on the Pastoral Epistles, by George G. Findlay. London: Hodder; New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 492, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.; $2.00.

Sadler, M. F., Rev. The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul. With notes critical and practical; being the 11th volume of the New Testament Commentary. New York: Pott, 1891. 12mo, cloth, $2.00.

Sayce, A. H. The Races of the Old Testament. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 180, 12mo, cloth, $1.20.

Schaff, Philip, D.D. The Renaissance: The Revival of Learning and Art in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. New York: Putnams, 1891. Pp. iii., 132, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Schneller, L. Evangelienfahrten. Bilder aus dem Leben Jesu in der Beleuchtung des heiligen Landes im Anschlusse an die Sonntagsevangelien. Leipzig: Wallman, 1891. Pp. xii., 575. 8vo, 5.80 mk.

Sohm, Rudolph. A History of Christianity. From the German, by Charles W. Rishell; with revisions, notes and additions. Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. ii., 368, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Spitta, F. Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Quellen und deren geschichtlichen Werth. Halle a. S.: Waisenhauses, 1891. Pp. xi., 380, 8vo, 8 mk.

Spurgeon, Charles H., Rev. Morning by Morning; or, Daily Readings for the Family or the Closet. New York: Am. Tr Soc., 1891. Pp. viii., 408, 12mo, $1.00. (Also) Evening by Evening; or, Readings at Eventide. For the Family or the Closet. The same. Pp. viii., 400, 12mo, $1.00.

Stearns, Edward J., D D. The Faith of our Forefathers. An examination of Archbp. Gibbons's "Faith of our Fathers." New ed. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 380, 12mo, 50 cts.

Stokes, G. G., Sir. Natural Theology. The Gifford lectures, delivered before the University of Edinburgh in 1891. London: Black, 1891. Pp. 274, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Terrill, Joseph Goodwin. Talks to Sunday-School Teachers. Syracuse: Hall, 1891. Pp. xv., 192, 12mo, 75 cts.

Tiele, C. P. Geschiedenis van den Godsdienst in de oudheid tot op Alexander den Groote. Nieuwe, geheel omgewerkte en vermeerderde uitgave van "De Geschiedenis van den Godsdienst tot aan de heerschappij der wereld godsdiensten." Deel I. 1te helft. Amsterdam: Van Kampen, 1891. Pp. viii., 1-204, 8vo, 2.25 fl.

Tomkins, H. G., Rev. Life and Times of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 191, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Tyler, Josiah, Rev. Forty Years among the Zulus. Boston: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. iii., 300, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Van Dyke, Henry J., D.D. The Lord's Prayer. New York: Tibbals, 1891. Pp. 194, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Vernier, Donat. Histoire du patriarcat Arménien Catholique. Paris: Delhomme, 1891. Pp. vi., 201, 16mo.

Vernier, F. La ruine de Ninive et l'oracle de Nahoum, étude historique, exégétique et critique. Thèse. Montauban: Granié, 1891. Pp. 76, 8vo.

Vigoroux, F. Dictionnaire de la Bible, contenant tous les noms de personnes, de lieux, de plantes, d'animaux, mentionnés dans les Saintes Écritures, etc. Fasciculus 1. Towes: Mame, 1891. Pp. 319, 4to, 5 fr.

Vincent, Marvin R, D.D. Exegesis. An address delivered at the opening of the Autumn term of Union Theological Seminary, September 24, 1891. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. 47, 8vo, 30 cts.

Warren, S. Edward, C. E. The Sunday Question; or, the Lord's Day: Its Sacredness, Permanence, and Value as shown by its Origin, History, and Use. Boston: Earle, 1891. Pp. 290, 12mo, $1.50.

Weaver, Emily. The Rabbi's Sons. A story of the days of St. Paul. Boston: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. iii., 381, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Weill, Alexandre. Les Cinq Livres (mosaïstes) de moïse. Traduit textuellement sur l'hebreu, avec commentaires et étymologies, etc. 4e livre. Paris: Reiff, 1891. Pp. xv., 211, 8vo, 5 fr.

Weiss, J. H., Lect. Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Tradition. V. Theil. Inhalt: Vom Anfange des 6. Jahrtausends jüd. Z.-R. bis zur Vertreibung der Juden aus Spanien. (In hebräischer Sprache.) Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. x., 303, 8vo, 6 mk. (Theile I.-Y. 28 mk.)

Wells, James. Rev., M.A. Christ and the Heroes of Heathendom. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 159, 12mo, 40 cts.

Wendland, P. Neu entdeckte Fragmente Philos, nebst einer Untersuchung über die ursprüngliche Gestalt der Schrift *de sacrificiis Abelis et Caini.* Berlin: Reimer, 1891. Pp. xi., 152, 8vo, 5 mk.

Whiting, Mary Bradford. Come Unto Me. Daily readings on the sayings of Christ. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 136, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Wickelhaus, J. Mittheilungen aus den Vorlesungen über das alte Testament. Herausgegeben von A. Zahn. 1. und 2. Heft. Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1891. 8vo, 2.60 mk. (Inhalt. 1. Aus den Psalmen. Pp. 163, 1.60 mk. 2. Aus Mose und den Propheten. 1 mk.)

Wingate, F. R. Mahdiism and the Egyptian Soudan. Being an account of the rise and progress of mahdiism and of subsequent events in the Soudan to the present time. London: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 630, 8vo, 30s.

Winter, J., Rabbi Dr. und Wünsche, August, Prof., Dr. Die jüdische Litteratur seit Abschluss des Kanons. Eine prosaische und poetische Anthologie mit biographischen und litterargeschichtlichen Einleitungen, unter Mitwirkung hervorragender Gelehrten herausgegeben. (In etwa 18 Lieferungen.) 1. Lieferung. Das hellenistisch-targumistische Schriftthum. Trier: Mayer, 1891. Pp. 96, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Wordsworth, Bishop (of St. Andrews). Annals of my Early life, 1806-1846. With occasional compositions in Latin and English verse. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 516, 8vo, 15s.

Wünsche, August, Prof., Dr. Midrasch Tehillim oder haggadische Erklärung der Psalmen. Nach der Textausgabe von Salom. Buber zum ersten Male ins Deutsche übersetzt. (In etwa 6 Lieferungen.) 1. Lieferung. Trier: Mayer, 1891. Pp. 1-96, 8vo, 2 mk.

Wynne, T. R., D.D. Our Sacred Commission. New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 220, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Wynne, T. R., D.D., Barnard, J. H., D.D., and Hemphill, S. The Literature of the Second Century. New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 270, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 20th of each month.)

Sept. 24-29. Eighth Annual Convention of the Young Men's Christian Associations of the Pacific Northwest, at Spokane, W. T.

Oct. 6. Seventeenth Annual Convention of the National Union of Catholic Young Men of America, at Philadelphia, Pa.

Oct. 9. Fortieth Anniversary of the ordination and installation of the Rev. James R. Graham (Presbyterian), in Kent Street Church, Winchester, Va.

Oct. 16-24. Annual convention of the C. W. B. M., Allegheny City, Pa.

Oct. 17. Dedication of the Lucy Webb Hayes Bible College and Missionary Training School, Washington, D. C.

Oct. 20. Annual meeting of the Foreign Christian Mission Society, Allegheny, Pa.

Oct. 21-23. The Universalist General Convention at Worcester, Mass.

Oct. 22-24. Twelfth Annual Convention of the American Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance, Nashville, Tenn.

Oct. 22-24. Sixth Annual Convention of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, St. Louis, Mo.

Oct. 26-29. First meeting of the Baptist Young People's Union (the first union of the kind organized in the Eastern States), at Mount Holly, N. J.

Oct. 26-29. Eighth Annual Session of the Pacific Unitarian Conference at Los Angeles, Cal.

Oct. 28. First regular convention of the Rocky Mountain Synod, in St. Paul's English Lutheran Church, Denver, Col.

Oct. (?). Organization in London of the Evangelization Society for South America.

Oct. 28. Consecration of Rev. Isaac Lea Nicholson, D.D., as P. E. Bishop of Milwaukee, at St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Oct. 28-29. Annual meeting of the Unitarian Sunday-School Society, at Fitchburg, Mass.

Oct. 29-*Nov.* 5. Annual meeting National Woman's Home Missionary Society (M. E.), Washington, D. C.

Nov. 4. The Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, answered the citation on the charge of heresy brought against him in the New York Presbytery, and by vote of 94 (ministers 71, elders 23) to 39 (ministers 27, elders 12), the Presbytery dismissed the case without expressing an opinion on its merits.

Nov. 5-11. Sixth Annual Convention of Christian Workers, at Washington, D. C.

Nov. 11. Unitarian Conference of the Middle States and Canada, in the Lenox Avenue Unitarian Church, New York City.

Nov. 11. sqq. Meeting of the General Missionary Committee of the M. E. Church at Cleveland, O.

Nov. 11-17. First Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Twelfth of the National W. C. T. U.

Nov. 17-19. Meeting of the Baptist Missionary Union, at Buffalo, N. Y.

Nov. 17-20. The Fourteenth Church Congress (Protestant Episcopal), at Washington, D. C. The following is the programme:

Topic I.—Tuesday, Nov. 17, 7.30 P.M., "Theism and Evolution." *Writers*—The Rev. Edwin Harwood, D.D., New Haven, Conn.; the Rev. S. D. McConnell, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa. *Speakers*—The Rev. H. L. Ziegenfus, D.D., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; the Rev. Prof. Elwood Worcester, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

Topic II.—Wednesday, Nov. 18, 10.30 A.M., "Socialism." *Writers*—The Rev. Reese F. Alsop, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.; the Rev. Pascal Harrower, Staten Island, N. Y.; the Rev. H M. Bartlett, Montchouin, Del. *Speakers*—The Rev. P. W. Sprague, Charlestown, Mass.; the Rev. William Prall, Ph.D., Detroit, Mich.; Prof. R. T. Ely, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Henry George, New York (possibly).

Topic III.—Wednesday, Nov. 18, 7.30 P.M., "Relations of the Clergy to Politics." *Writers*—The Rev. James Mulcahey, D.D., New York City; the Rev. H. L. Myrick, Sing Sing, N. Y. *Speakers*—General Morris Schaff, Pittsfield, Mass.; the Rev. Charles R. Baker, Brooklyn, N. Y.; the Rev. John W. Kramer, M.D., New York City.

Topic IV.—Thursday, Nov. 19, 10.30 A.M., "New and Old Parochial Methods." *Writers*—The Rev. George W. Shinn, D.D., Newton, Mass.; the Rev. Langdon Stewardson, Worcester, Mass.; the Rev. E. A. Bradley, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y. *Speakers*—The Rev. Henry A. Adams, Buffalo, N. Y.; the Rev. T. N. Morrison, Chicago, Ill.; the Rev. Henry L. Jones, Wilkes Barre, Pa.

Topic V.—Thursday, Nov. 19, 7.30 P.M., "Catholic and Protestant Tendencies in the Life of the Church." *Writers*—The Rev. Prof. Carl E. Grammer, Theological Seminary, Virginia; the Rev. Stewart Means, New Haven, Conn. *Speakers*—The Rev. Arthur Brooks, D.D., New York City; the Rev. James O. S. Huntington, New York City.

Topic VI.—Friday, Nov. 20, 10.30 A.M., "True Policy of Diocesan Missions." *Writers*—The Rt. Rev. E. R. Atwill, D.D., Bishop of West Missouri; the Rev. George A. Carstensen, New York City. *Speakers*—The Rev. J. T. Zorn, Morristown, N. Y.; the Rev. George C. Foley, Williamsport, Pa.

Topic VII.—Friday, Nov. 20, 2.30 P.M., "Personal Religion." *Writers*—The Rt. Rev. O. W. Whitaker, D.D., Bishop of Pennsylvania; the Rt. Rev. A. C. Coxe, D.D , LL.D., Bishop of Western New York (possibly). *Speakers*—The Rev. D. Parker Morgan, D.D., New York City; the Rev. Frank W. Baker, Cincinnati, O.; the Rev. Henry Mottet, New York City.

OBITUARY.

Tiffany, Rev. Otis Henry (Methodist Episcopal), D.D., died at Minneapolis, Minn., Saturday, October 24, 1891, aged 66. He filled several prominent pulpits in his denomination, such as St. Paul's and St. James', New York; Arch Street Church and Spring Garden Street Church, Philadelphia, and at his death was pastor of the Hennepin Avenue Church, Minneapolis.

Scrivener, Rev. Frederick Henry Ambrose (Church of England), LL.D. (St. Andrews, 1872), D.C.L. (Oxford, 1876), died in his rectory at Hendon, Middlesex, Monday, October 26, 1891, aged 78. He was one of the greatest Greek Testament textual scholars England has produced, and it is also owing to his pains that the Authorized Version of the English Bible appeared at Cambridge in such accurate shape. His "Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament" is the best book of its kind in English. For the last twenty years of his life he received a pension of £100, in recognition of his eminent biblical services.

Preston, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Thomas Scott (Roman Catholic), D.D. (Seton Hall College, N. J., 1880), Vicar General of the Diocese of New York, died in New York City, Wednesday, November 11, 1891, aged 67. He was brought up in and in 1846 was ordained in the Episcopal Church; but under the influence of the Tractarian movement he entered the Church of Rome in 1849, and has ever since labored in New York City. In 1871 he built St. Ann's; in 1873 became vicar general; in 1881, a domestic prelate to the Pope, which gave him his title Monsignor (contracted to Mgr.); in 1888 prothonotary apostolic. He was an eloquent, devoted, prudent, and obedient servant of his church, and much beloved. He published numerous volumes of sermons and lectures, and "The Purgatorian Manual; or, A Selection of Prayers and Devotions," New York, 1867.

Taylor, Rev. William James Romeyn (Reformed Dutch Church), D.D. (Rutgers, 1860), died on his way from Colorado Springs, Col., to Salt Lake City, Thursday, November, 12, 1891, aged 68. He was from 1862 to 1857 corresponding secretary of the American Bible Society; from 1869 to 1889 pastor in Newark; since then secretary of the American Sabbath Union, in whose service he was travelling when he died. He was the author of several volumes and many articles in the religious press.

Eddy, Rev. Zachary (Congregationalist), D.D. (Williams, 1858), died at Detroit, Mich., Sunday, November 15, 1891, aged 76. For the last five years he was not settled. He is remembered as the editor of the "Hymns of the Church," the official hymnbook of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, and as joint editor of "Hymns and Songs of Praise" and "Carmina Sanctorum."

Imbrie, Rev. Charles Kisselman (Presbyterian), D.D., pastor emeritus of the First Presbyterian Church, Jersey City; died there Friday, Nov. 20, 1891, aged 77. He had lived in Jersey City forty years, and was a beloved leader in New Jersey Presbyterianism.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5. JANUARY, 1892. No. 4.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

ROGER WILLIAMS.

BY A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN McMASTER UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, ONTARIO.

ROGER WILLIAMS was born about A.D. 1600, probably in Wales. Through the influence of Sir Edward Coke, the famous jurist, long his patron, he became a scholar of Sutton's Hospital (now the Charter House) in 1621, where he obtained an exhibition in 1624. The following year he became a pensioner in Pembroke College, Cambridge, and was graduated in 1627. He is said to have been an expert reporter, and to have made himself useful to his great patron through the employment of this art. There is an old tradition, probable enough in itself, that he devoted considerable attention to the study of law. Whether during, before, or after his university course, he was led to adopt rigorous Separatist principles. The England of 1630 was no place for Nonconformists of even a more moderate type than young Roger Williams. In December of that year he set sail for New England, hoping there to be permitted to enjoy a measure of soul-liberty denied him at home. "Truly it was as bitter as death to me," he writes, some years later to the daughter of Sir Edward Coke, "when Bishop Laud pursued me out of this land, and my conscience was persuaded against the national church, and ceremonies, and bishops, beyond the conscience of your dear father. I say it was as bitter as death to me, when I rode Windsor way, to take ship at Bristol and saw Stoke House, where the blessed man was, and I then durst not acquaint him with my conscience and my flight."

There can be no doubt but that he made a great sacrifice, not in sentiment alone, but in position and prospects as well, in loyally following the dictates of conscience. "God knows," he wrote, forty years afterward, "what gains and preferments I have refused in universities, city, country, and court in Old England, and something in New England, to keep my soul undefiled in this point, and not to act with a doubting conscience." Roger Williams was not only one of the most accomplished scholars of his age (he was familiar with the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Dutch and French languages), but he had a dignity of bearing, an eloquence and persuasiveness of tongue and pen, and a force of character, that would have commanded for him the highest positions at home or abroad. Like the great apostle, he counted not such things dear unto him in comparison with loyalty to conscience and to Christ.

Landing in New England in February, 1631, a highly attractive opening almost immediately presented itself. The pastor of the Boston church was returning to England for a prolonged visit, and young Williams was invited to supply his place. Did he accept the invitation? Far from it. The Boston church was "an unseparated church," and he "durst not officiate to" it. With him conscience was absolutely supreme, because it represented God's will. He was prompted to give utterance, while at Boston, to a conviction formed, no doubt, long before, familiar and commonplace now, startling and revolutionary then and there, that the magistrate might not punish any sort of "breach of the first table," such as idolatry, Sabbath-breaking, false worship, blasphemy, etc.; and he had thus succeeded in convincing the leading men of the Boston colony that he was an impracticable and dangerous man—all the more dangerous because of his splendid gifts and attainments and his unswerving loyalty to conscience. It was only what might have been expected, when the Salem church a few months later invited him to be their teacher, that six of the leading men of Boston should have sent a joint letter of warning to Governor Endicott of

Salem. For the time being they succeeded in "heading him off," and he soon afterward betook himself to the older and more thoroughly Separatist Plymouth colony, where he was cordially received and soon became associated as teacher with Ralph Smith, pastor of the church. Here he remained for about two years. According to Governor Bradford, "his teaching was well approved, for the benefit whereof I still bless God, and am thankful to him, even for his sharpest admonitions and reproofs, so far as they agreed with truth." According to Brewster, elder of the church, toward the close of the period Roger Williams began to "vent" "divers of his own singular opinions," and to seek "to impose them upon others." The more conservative among the members began to foresee "that he would run the same course of rigid separatism and anabaptistry which Mr. John Smith, the Sebaptist at Amsterdam, had done." "Not finding such concurrence as he expected, he desired his dismission to the church of Salem," which with considerable reluctance on the part of some was granted. It is certain that the influential people at Boston were steadily using their influence against him and fostering any spirit of dissatisfaction that may have arisen.

During his stay at Plymouth he spent much time with the Indians, and succeeded in so far mastering their language as to be able to converse freely with them, and afterward to write the "Key into the Language of America," and in so gaining their confidence and love as to be of incalculable service to all the colonies long after he had been banished from Massachusetts. "My soul's desire," he wrote some time afterward, "was to do the natives good. God was pleased to give me a painful, patient spirit to lodge with them in their filthy, smoky holes, even when I lived at Plymouth and Salem, to gain their tongue." So great was his influence over them, that if he had been bent on making mere nominal Christians of them, he could, he thought, have baptized whole tribes of them.

In August, 1634, he was invited to succeed Skelton in the pastorate of the Salem church, having since his arrival acted as assistant to the enfeebled pastor. The Boston people remonstrated, as we shall see, and a struggle ensued that led to his banishment in the midst of winter—January, 1636. Befriended by the Indians, after much hardship, he reached Narragansett Bay. Here he secured land from the Indians and established a colony on the principles of absolute liberty of conscience. Here and on his visits to England he wrote those great works in defence of these principles, that along with his practical carrying out of these principles have won for him undying fame. Here, also, he died and was buried in 1683, having more than completed fourscore years.

Pause we here to take a rapid survey of contemporary history before we proceed to a special discussion of some of the more prominent events in his New England life, and some of the more important features of his teaching. The first thirty years of Roger Williams's manhood coincided with the most momentous period in modern times. The Continent of Europe was convulsed with the most destructive war of history, from one point of view a great struggle between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism for ascendancy. The Peace of Westphalia, 1648, is one of the landmarks of history. The Puritan Revolution, that great conflict between royal and priestly absolutism and the spirit of civil and religious liberty, that was inherent in the British people, and that had by 1640 gained momentum enough to sweep away for the time kingcraft and priestcraft together by one fell stroke, may be said to have begun in 1628, three years before Roger Williams sailed for America, and continued during most of his manhood years. For two or three years he was contemporary at Cambridge with John Milton, somewhat his junior. Though not members of the same college they may have known each other at this time, as they certainly did some twenty years later, when both were startling the world with eloquent radical pleas for freedom. "The Secretary of the Council, Mr. Milton, for my Dutch I read him, read me many more languages," wrote Williams, after his visit to England in 1651. Here also he may have known Henry Jessey and Hanserd Knollys, soon to become the able leaders of the English Baptists. The Duke of Buckingham, the power behind the throne during the later years of James and the earlier years of Charles I., had become so odious to the people that there was general rejoicing when his career was brought to an end by Felton's knife, August, 1628. It is not likely that either Williams or Milton shed many tears over this event, however little they approved of the means by which Buckingham's unrighteous career was brought to an end. William Laud, the typical High Churchman, who combined in his own person some of the best and some of the worst features of a Wolsey, a

Mazarin, and a Torquemada, was already beginning to rival Buckingham in the confidence of the king, and was placed by the assassination of the latter at the head of civil and ecclesiastical administration. The "reign of thorough" ensued. The Star Chamber reminded the persecuted Nonconformists of the Spanish Inquisition. Laud had eyes to spy out heresy from one end of the kingdom to the other. Imprisonment, whipping, branding, mutilation, to say nothing of the imposition of ruinous fines, were the order of the day. The king and his ministers decided to dispense with the services of Parliament and to establish a despotism. The Civil War, the Commonwealth, the Protectorate, and the Restoration, all came well within the active lifetime of Roger Williams. In France the provisions of the Edict of Nantes in favor of the Protestants were being systematically violated, and Richelieu, while for political reasons he was giving aid to the Protestants of Germany and Sweden, was employing the resources of the kingdom to crush the Huguenots.

In 1614 Leonard Busher, a Baptist—probably a member of the noble band that had returned to England from Holland two years before for conscience' sake—addressed to King James an earnest, able plea for liberty of conscience, to be followed a year later by "Persecution for Religion Judged and Condemned," and in 1620 by "A Most Humble Supplication" emanating from the same circle of believers. Though Roger Williams was still a youth when the last of these documents appeared, it is probable that they exerted a determining influence on his life. He certainly became familiar with them at an early date in his New England career, and he reprinted the last-mentioned writing in his "Bloody Tenent." His own pleas are more vigorous than these, but not more scriptural or sound. While Williams was yet a boy, in 1616, Henry Jacob, an earnest Separatist, had returned to England with his congregation that had been formed in Zeeland, and this congregation maintained itself in London, in the face of direst persecution, until long after Williams's departure. From 1633 onward it became famous as the mother of Particular Baptist churches. Another band of English exiles, that had spent years in Leyden under the ministry of the famous John Robinson, had been conveyed by the Mayflower to Plymouth Rock in 1620. During the eleven years that intervened between their arrival and that of Roger Williams, they had willingly endured great hardship for the sake of the freedom of conscience that was theirs in the wilderness. Robinson had taught them not only to love freedom for themselves, but also to accord a measure of toleration to others. In his tender farewell address he warned them against supposing that they had reached final views of divine truth, and encouraged them to expect that new light would yet dawn on God's Word. We shall see that even in Roger Williams's time the colony had retained the impress of John Robinson. At Salem a company of English Nonconformists, uncompromisingly opposed to Separatism, had settled a few years later and completed its organization in 1629. "We will not say," they wrote, "as the Separatists were wont to say, Farewell, Babylon! Farewell, Rome! but we will say, Farewell, dear England! Farewell to the Church of God in England, and all the Christian friends there! We do not go to New England as Separatists from the Church of England; though we cannot but separate from the corruptions in it, but we go to practice the positive part of Church reformation, and propagate the Gospel in America." At first the Salem colonists looked askance at the Plymouth people as Brownists, but Providence soon drew the two colonies together. An epidemic of fever and scurvy of a virulent type attacked the Salem settlers, and they felt obliged to send to Plymouth for a doctor. Dr. Fuller was not only a healer of bodies, but had skill with souls as well. The Salem people became convinced through his ministrations that the Plymouth settlers were not by any means so objectionable as they had been led to suppose. The two colonies were soon in cordial fellowship. Far more numerous and wealthy, and far more remote from Separatism, was the Massachusetts Bay colony, formed in 1630. In leaving England they asked for the prayers of their "brethren in and of the Church of England." They wished to be thought of as those who "esteemed it their honor to call the Church of England, from whence they rose, their dear mother, and could not part from their native country where she specially resided, without much sadness of heart and many tears in their eyes; ever acknowledging that such hope and part as they had obtained in the common salvation they had received in her bosom and sucked it from her breasts. They leave it not, therefore, as loathing the milk wherewith they were nourished there." One is tempted to suspect that this fulsomeness of compliment was dictated quite as much by policy as by genuine emotion ; for nothing is more certain than that the leaders of the colony abominated from the bottom of their hearts the then dominant party in the Church of England ; it is a matter of history that they refused to tolerate Church of England services in the colony, and it is just as clear that they were anxious to secure as advantageous a charter as possible from a government intensely hostile to Nonconformity. Under the influence of the Plymouth people the Salem church was soon so imbued with Separatism, that the pastor refused to admit to communion leading members of the Massachusetts Bay colony, and declined to baptize the infant of one of them, because they were not as yet members of any particular church apart from the Church of England. It is wonderful how soon the colony repudiated in effect the Church of England, and proceeded to complete its semi-Presbyterian theocratic form of government. Roger Williams arrived at Boston about one year after the colony had been established. The next year (1632) it was enacted, that "to the end that the body of the commons may be preserved of honest and good men . . . for the time to come no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic, but such as are members of some of the churches within the limit of the same." Exclusion from a church meant loss of citizenship, and the General Court was ready to carry out by force ecclesiastical decisions. We can scarcely conceive of a more perfect equipment for the exercise of tyranny and the violation of conscience than existed in this small community thus organized, where the life of each individual was constantly subjected to the closest scrutiny. That this legislation was not a dead letter on the statute book we shall soon see.

It need scarcely be said that the idea of liberty of conscience, though it had been ably advocated in England for nearly twenty years, had not dawned upon the minds of the leaders of the Boston company. If anybody felt impelled to teach or practice anything at variance with the teachings and practices of the standing order, the world was wide and there was room enough outside the jurisdiction of the company, inside he could not remain.

It must be admitted that men of convictions and conscience are not always the most agreeable members of society. The man who concentrates his attention on one or two matters that seem to his contemporaries matters of minor moment, and advocates his peculiar views in such a way as to cause division and to bring the community into bad repute, can scarcely expect to be cordially treated in any age or in any land. The man who is travailing in spirit with a great revolutionary idea is likely to do less than justice to other ideas and to existing institutions, and to act without regard to immediate consequences. Roger Williams was a man of profound convictions on a particular class of subjects. To us the importance of the matters upon which he fixed his attention is manifest ; but we are forced to admit that he was often extreme and inconsiderate in the pressing of his convictions. The necessity of the absolute separation of Church and State, the necessity of complete separation from an apostate Church, the vast importance of liberty of conscience and the utter iniquity of violation of conscience, had burned themselves into his soul. We can do him full honor for his consistent advocacy of these principles in season and out of season, for his dinning these principles into the ears of his contemporaries till they were forced to hear, without being unduly severe in our judgment of his opponents and persecutors.

Let us look more particularly at the points in which he came in conflict with the standing order :

1. He was an ardent Separatist, regarding the Church of England as utterly apostate, and considering it a sin to have any sort of communion with it, a sin so grievous as to place those who were guilty of it, or those who had fellowship with those guilty of it, outside the pale of his fellowship. This view he remorselessly pressed from the date of his arrival to the time of his expulsion, at great self-sacrifice and to the unspeakable discomfort of those who did not see eye to eye with him in this matter.

2. He was radically and unalterably opposed to the charter of the company, and regarded the colony as committing an enormous sin in living under it. He insisted on having it returned to King Charles without delay. In his opinion it contained "matter of falsehood and injustice, falsehood in making the king the first Christian prince who had discovered these parts ; and injustice in giving the country to his English subjects, which belonged to the native Indians." According to his own account of the matter written some years later, he and others, "not a few," were convinced of "the sin of the patents, wherein Christian kings (so-called) are invested with right, by virtue of their Christianity, to take and give away the lands of other men ; as also the unchristian oaths swallowed down at

their coming forth from Old England, especially in superstitious Laud's time, and domineering. And I know these thoughts so deeply afflicted the soul of the discusser in the time of his walking in the way of New England's worship, that he at last came to a persuasion, that such sins could not be expiated without returning again into England, or a public acknowledgment and confession of the evil of so and so departing. To this purpose, before his troubles and banishment, he drew up a letter (not without the approbation of some of the chief of New England, then tender also upon this point before God) directed unto the king himself, humbly acknowledging the evil of that part of the patent which respects the donation of land, etc. This letter and other endeavors (tending to wash off public sins and, above all, to pacify and give glory unto God), it may be that counsels from flesh and blood suppressed." From Governor Winthrop's account it appears that Williams charged King James with blasphemy for calling Europe Christendom, and applied to King Charles some of the most opprobrious passages in the Apocalypse. To this, among other causes, he attributed his banishment. When we reflect upon the extreme danger in which the colony stood from unfriendly interference on the part of the home government, it is easy to realize the consternation into which the utterance of such sentiments, and especially the proposal to write the king setting forth the iniquity of the patent, must have thrown the responsible leaders of the colony. The ordinary arguments by which the appropriation of the land of savage peoples is still defended were used in vain on Roger Williams. The representation of the fearful peril to which he was exposing the colony made no impression whatever upon him. Conscience was uttering its voice, and it should not in him, at least, go unheeded.

3. Equally strong and unalterable were his convictions against the administration of oaths to the unregenerate, and the inviting of such to join in prayer or any act of worship. To protect itself against disloyal persons, who were likely to cause disharmony in the colony and to send slanderous and injurious reports to England, it was decided soon after Williams's arrival to administer an oath of fidelity to the people indiscriminately. Most vehemently did he oppose the oath, "partly," according to John Cotton, "because it was Christ's prerogative to have His office established by oath; partly because an oath was a part of God's worship, and God's worship was not to be put upon carnal persons, as he conceived many of the people to be." "So by his tenet," Cotton proceeds, "neither might church-members nor other godly men take the oath, because it was the establishment not of Christ, but of mortal men in their office; nor might men out of the Church take it, because in his eye they were but carnal." Such sturdy opposition to a favorite measure did not tend, to any appreciable extent, to re-establish Roger Williams in the good graces of the court, especially as that self-respecting body felt itself obliged thereby "to desist from that proceeding."

4. But the immediate and probably the most influential causes of Roger Williams's banishment, were his defiant attitude toward the court and the leading churches of the colony, in accepting the pastorate of the Salem church against their earnest and oft-repeated protest; and the proceedings of the Salem church under his direction with reference to a certain piece of land. The Salem church and colony petitioned the court for a tract of land near Marblehead, to which they considered themselves entitled. What more natural than that the court should make its favorable action conditional on the church's making amends for their insolent conduct in installing Williams against the remonstrance of court and ministers. "We will wait," wrote the magistrates, "before giving answer to your request, until there shall be time to test more fully the quality of your allegiance to the power, which you desire should be interposed on your behalf." The court thus said, in effect, "Get rid of that pestilential Roger Williams without delay, and we will reward your subserviency by bestowing on you the coveted acres." It was an outrageous attempt to influence church action by a bribe; but it is a mode of procedure of which modern examples could doubtless be found in all denominations of Christians. Do we wonder that Williams and the Salem church were thoroughly indignant? Wisely or unwisely, they framed a red-hot denunciation of the proceeding and sent it to the other churches, admonishing them of the heinous sin of which their members, the magistrates, had been guilty. It will be remembered that citizenship, and, of course, the right to hold office, was dependent on church-membership. The aim of the Salem church, under Roger Williams's guidance, would seem to have been to induce the churches to compel the magistrates by disciplinary means to deal righteously or to depose them from office by excluding

them from membership. Roger Williams has been charged with inconsistency in being a party to such an admonition; but it is not clear why the Salem church was not justified, in view of the relation that existed, in appealing to sister churches to discipline members that had committed grievous wrong. It was not against magistrates as such, but against offending church-members that the complaint was uttered. But, however justifiable the procedure may have been, it was certainly in the highest degree impolitic. The churches and magistrates were irritated thereby beyond measure, and proceeded to labor so vigorously with the offending church as to induce a majority to abandon their heroic pastor and consent to his removal. Roger Williams, on his part, was led to denounce in scathing language the Massachusetts churches and to renounce communion with them. Moreover, he would have no further fellowship with the Salem church unless they would join him in his denunciation and disfellowshipping of the other churches. A majority of the members refusing so to do, he never entered the church again, but held services in his own house with such as were faithful to his principles.

The decision to banish Roger Williams was not hastily arrived at. Indeed, if we bear in mind the court's freedom from conscientious scruples as to the employment of force in matters of religion, and the pertinacity with which Roger Williams advocated views regarded as unsettling and dangerous, we can scarcely fail to admire the forbearance of this body. The process, or rather processes, that resulted in banishment began over a year before the banishment took place. In December, 1634, he was summoned to appear before the next session of the court, to be held in the following March. The charge preferred was that of preaching against the charter, and his "usual terming the Church of England anti-Christian." John Cotton, the Boston minister, persuaded the court "to forbear civil prosecution" until the ministers should have "dealt with him in a church way to convince him of sin." Meanwhile arose the difficulty as to the freeman's oath, already referred to. He was now arraigned before the court, and in the opinion of his opponents, though by no means in his own, "confuted" by the ministers; but the court was not prepared even yet to adopt extreme measures. At about this time (May, 1635) the Salem church, in defiance of the court and the ministers, proceeded to make Roger Williams full pastor. Williams was no doubt encouraged by this show of confidence to continue his sharp denunciations of the charter and the oath. In July he was again summoned to court and charged with advocating opinions dangerous to the common welfare. Besides the matters already mentioned, he is charged with maintaining "that a man ought not to pray with the unregenerate," and "that a man ought not to give thanks after the sacrament nor after meat." The controversy about the Marblehead land followed. A decree of banishment was issued October 19th, 1635, to take effect within six weeks. A severe illness, contracted while attending court, prevented the carrying out of the decree within the appointed time, and he was permitted to remain until spring, provided he would abstain from teaching his peculiar views. It transpired, however, that his sympathizers were in the habit of gathering at his house, and that he was disregarding the restriction. Arrangements had been made to seize him and transport him to England, where he might experience the tender mercies of Laud. Forewarned, he took refuge in the wilderness. He made his way to his Indian friends, who shared with him such comforts as they had. "I was sorely tossed for one fourteen weeks," he wrote, some years afterward, "not knowing what bread or bed did mean." He complains bitterly in another writing of having been "exposed to winter miseries in a howling wilderness." He believed firmly that if he had perished in his wilderness wanderings his blood would have been on the heads of his persecutors.

To relate in detail the subsequent history of this truth-loving, truth-living man would unduly lengthen this article. The space available may best be devoted (1) to giving, largely in his own words, Roger Williams's views on liberty of conscience; (2) to giving some account of the practical carrying out of these views in the founding of a colony; and (3) to a brief statement of his relations to Baptist principles and practices.

"If we were forced to adopt a modern designation for him," writes Professor Masson, "we should call him the father of all that has figured anywhere, in Great Britain, or in the United States, or in the British colonies, under the name of Voluntaryism." Elsewhere he designates him an "arch-individualist." He advocated the most complete separation of Church and State at a time when there was no historical example of such separation; nay, at a time when to Christian men everywhere such a separation was almost inconceivable. The following paragraphs set forth succinctly his view of the relations of Church and State:

"The civil magistrate either respecteth that religion and worship which his conscience is persuaded is true, and upon which he ventures his soul; or else that and those which he is persuaded are false. Concerning the first, if that which the magistrate believeth to be true, be true, I say he owes a threefold duty unto it: First, approbation and countenance, a reverent esteem and honorable testimony . . . . with a tender respect for truth and the professors of it. Secondly, personal submission of his own soul to the power of the Lord Jesus in the spiritual government and kingdom. Thirdly, protection of such true professors of Christ, whether apart or met together, as also of their estates, from violence and injury. . . . If it be a false religion (unto which the civil magistrate dare not adjoin, yet), he owes: First, permission (for approbation he owes not to that which is evil). . . . Secondly, he owes protection to the persons of his subjects (though of a false worship) that no injury be offered either to the persons or goods of any." Here we have the gist of his contention expressed in his own words. How ably and how voluminously he defended the principles involved, by means of Scripture, history, and reason, any one can see who will take the trouble to read "The Bloody Tenent of Persecution," "The Bloody Tenent yet More Bloody," and other minor treatises bearing on this subject. Some time after Roger Williams's banishment the learned and godly John Cotton, pastor of the Boston church, felt it his duty to make one more effort to convert Williams from the error of his ways. In a long letter, afterward published, he attempted to justify the New England State-Church arrangement, and the employment of the civil magistracy in carrying out church discipline. He refused to admit that Williams had been hardly dealt with, and sought to throw the entire responsibility upon Williams himself. He even attributed the severe illness Williams suffered, just after the decree of banishment, to God's displeasure with his conduct, and suggested that he should consider banishment from a country with whose inhabitants he could have no religious fellowship, a blessing rather than a hardship. Williams's somewhat caustic answer to this document was published soon afterward. Cotton published an elaborate rejoinder, in which he ransacked the Scriptures for materials to be used in justifying the union of Church and State, and the punishment of religious delinquencies by the civil magistracy. His principal reliance was, of course, on the Old Testament; but by unnatural and forced interpretations he sought to bring a number of New Testament passages likewise to the support of his position. He appealed also to history, and sought to show the utter impracticability of *laissez faire* in religion. He sought also to vindicate his own consistency in separating from the Church of England and complaining of the Laudian régime, and yet in New England refusing toleration to those who differed from him. This called forth (in 1644) Williams's famous "Bloody Tenent of Persecution," already mentioned. Cotton replied in "The Bloody Tenent of Persecution Washed in the Blood of the Lamb." Williams rejoined in the most voluminous of all his works, "The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody, by Mr. Cotton's Endeavor to wash it white in the Blood of the Lamb, of whose precious Blood, spilt in the Blood of his Servants, and of the Blood of Millions spilt in former and later Wars for Conscience' sake, that most Bloody Tenent of Persecution for cause of Conscience, upon a second Trial, is found now more apparently and more notoriously guilty."

It will be impracticable for us to follow Roger Williams in the intricacies of his argument through his thousand pages. A few quotations bearing upon one or other aspect of the great question under discussion must suffice. He speaks of "that body-killing, soul-killing, and State-killing doctrine of not permitting, but persecuting all other consciences and ways of worship but his own in the civil state, and so consequently in the whole world, if the power or empire thereof were in his (Cotton's) hand." Again: "Soul yokes, soul oppression, plunderings, ravishings, etc., are of a crimson and deepest dye, and I believe the chief of England's sins, unstopping the vials of England's present sorrows." "Only two things," he writes, "I shall humbly suggest . . . as the greatest causes, fountains, and tap-roots of all the indignation of the Most High against the State and country: First, that the whole nations and generations of men have been forced (though unregenerate and unrepentant) to pretend and assume the name of Christ Jesus, which only belongs, according to the institution of the Lord Jesus, to truly regenerate and repenting souls. Secondly, that all others dissenting from them, whether Jews or Gentiles, their countrymen especially (for strangers have a liberty) have not been permitted civil cohabitation in this world with them, but have been distressed and persecuted by them." Again: "The greatest yokes yet lying on English necks are of a spiritual and soul nature." "This tenet of the magistrates, keeping the Church from apostatizing, by practising civil force upon the consciences of men, is so far from preserving religion pure, that it is a mighty bulwark or barricade to keep out all true religion; yea, and all godly magistrates for (from ?) ever coming into the world." This is a fine bit of sarcasm: "Are the armories of the true King Solomon Christ Jesus disarmed? Are there no spiritual swords girt upon the thighs of those valiant ones, that should guard his heavenly bed, except the sword of steel to be run for from the cutler's shop? Is the religion of Jesus Christ so poor and so weak and feeble grown, so cowardly and base, that neither the soldiers nor commanders in Christ's army have any courage or skill to withstand sufficiently in all points a false teacher, a false prophet, a spiritual cheater or deceiver?" "If the elders and churches and ordinances of Christ have such need of the civil sword for their maintenance and protection (I mean in spiritual things), sure the Lord Jesus cannot be excused for not being careful either to express this great ordinance in His will and testament, or else to have furnished the civil state and officers thereof with ability and hearts for this their great duty and employment, to which He hath called them." Having spoken of the monarchy of Christ and of ministerial power under Christ, he remarks: "There are three great competitors for this deputed or ministerial power of the Lord Jesus. First, the Arch-vicar, or Satan, the pretended Vicar of Christ on earth, who sits as God over the temple of God, exalting himself not only above all that is called God, but over the souls and consciences of all his vassals; yea, over the Spirit of Christ, over the Holy Scriptures, yea and God Himself." . . . The second great competitor to this crown of the Lord Jesus is the civil magistrate, whether emperors, kings, or other inferior officers of the State, who are made to believe by the false prophets of the world that they are the antitypes of the kings of Israel and Judah, and wear the crown of Christ. Under the wing of the civil magistrate do three great factions shelter themselves, and mutually oppose each other, striving as for life, who shall sit down under the shadow of that arm of flesh. First, prelacy. . . . Secondly, the presbytery, . . . who give so much to the civil magistrate as to make him absolutely the head of the Church: For, if they make him the reformer of the Church, the suppressor of schismatics and heretics, the protector and defender of the Church, etc., what is this in true plain English but to make him the judge of the true and false Church, judge of what is truth and what is error; who is schismatical, who heretical? . . . The third, though not so great, yet growing faction is that (so-called) Independent. . . . This latter jumps with the prelates, and (though not more fully) yet more explicitly than the Presbyterians cast down the crown of the Lord Jesus at the feet of the civil magistrate; and though they pretend to receive their ministry from the choice of two or three private persons in church covenant, yet they would fain persuade the mother, Old England, to imitate her daughter, New England's, practice—viz., to keep out the Presbyterians, and only to embrace themselves, both as the State's and the peoples' bishops." It is obvious that this remark would fairly apply not to the Independents, properly so called, but only to the semi-Presbyterian State-Church party that had been developed in New England, and such English Independents as sympathized with the New England principles and practices. "The third competition," he proceeds, "for this crown and power of the Lord Jesus is of those that separate both from the one and the other. . . . Of these, those that go furthest, profess they must yet come nearer to the ways of the Son of God, and doubtless so far as they have gone they bid the most and make the fairest plea for the purity and power of Christ Jesus. . . . Let the latter be considered, in their more thorough departure from sin and sinful worship, their condescending to the lowest and meanest contentments of this life, their exposing of themselves for Christ to greater sufferings, and their desiring no civil sword nor arm of flesh, but the two-edged sword of God's Spirit to try out the matter by; and then let the inhabitants of the world judge, which come nearest to the doctrine, holiness, poverty, patience, and practice of the Lord Jesus Christ; and whether or no these latter deserve not so much of humanity and the subjects' liberty, as (not offending the civil State) in the freedom of their souls to enjoy the common air to breathe in." The "inhabitants of the world" are more and more clearly coming to see that in rejecting Papacy and Cæsaro-papacy (whether in prelatical, presbyterian, or congregational form), Roger Williams was in this matter wholly right and his opponents wholly wrong. Congregationalists are to-day essentially on his platform, and Presbyterians no longer, as they did in Roger Williams's time almost universally, see in toleration "the depths of Satan," his "masterpiece for England," which if he could effect "he would think he had gained well by the Reformation and made a good exchange for the hierarchy."

As a founder of a state no less than as an advocate of a great principle Roger Williams deserves and will have the gratitude and respect of all students of history. Professor Masson describes this part of Williams's life-work as "The organization of a community on the unheard-of principle of absolute religious liberty combined with perfect civil democracy." Having personally secured the land that was needed from the natives, for a trifling consideration he gave equal rights with himself to twelve "loving friends and neighbors," "and such others as the major part of us shall admit into the same fellowship of vote with us." These promised to submit themselves in active or passive obedience to all such orders or agreements as should be made for public good of the body in an orderly way, by the major consent of the inhabitants, only in civil things. In a later document Roger Williams writes: "Having made covenant of peaceable neighborhood with all the sachems and natives round about us, and having in a sense of God's merciful providence unto me in my distress, called the place Providence, I desired it might be for a shelter for persons distressed for conscience; I then, considering the condition of divers of my distressed countrymen, communicated my said purchase to my loving friends." This first organization took place in 1638. In securing the land from the Indians Roger Williams had the valuable assistance of Sir Henry Vane, who also served him very efficiently a few years later in procuring a charter.

In 1640 another agreement was signed by thirty-nine freemen. Among the articles was the following: "We agree, as formerly hath been the liberties of this town, so still, to hold forth liberty of conscience."

Referring to the original code of laws for the colony, Judge Story said: "We read for the first time since Christianity ascended the throne of the Cæsars, the declaration, that 'conscience should be free, and men should not be punished for worshipping God in the way they were persuaded He required,' . . . a declaration, which, to the honor of Rhode Island, she has never departed from." "To this day," writes Professor Guild, "the annals of both city and State have remained unsullied by the blot of persecution."

By 1643 the colony had considerably increased in population, and difficulties had arisen as to the relation in which the colony stood to the older colonies to the north. In view of the fact that the Rhode Island colony had no charter from England, the Massachusetts colony sought to assert its jurisdiction over the Narragansett Bay settlements, especially as its interference was invited by a faction of the inhabitants. Moreover, the latter were at great disadvantage in the matter of trade, being denied the use of the New England seaports. In 1643 the Rhode Island and Providence people requested Roger Williams to proceed to England with a view to securing a charter that would put them on an equal footing with their neighbors. The civil war was raging when he reached England, and the Presbyterian party was in power. Through the influence of Sir Henry Vane, one of the foremost statesmen of the age, he obtained a charter for "The Incorporation of Providence Plantations, in the Narragansett Bay, in New England." This charter gave full power to the inhabitants "to rule themselves, and such others as shall hereafter inhabit within any part of the said tract of land, by such form of civil government, as by voluntary consent of all, or the greater part of them, they shall find most suitable to their estate and condition." He had been obliged to sail from New York in going for the charter; but in England he received such recognition as enabled him to return by way of Boston. This charter gave full liberty to Roger Williams and his friends to carry out, within a specified territory, their own views of civil government. In 1647 a constitution was adopted. It was therein declared, "that the form of government established in Providence Plantations is democratical—that is to say, a government held by the free and voluntary consent of all, or a greater part of the free inhabitants." The document concludes with these words: "These are the laws that concern all men, and these are the penalties for the transgression thereof, which by common consent are ratified and established throughout this whole colony; and otherwise than thus what is herein forbidden, all men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God. And let the saints of the Most High walk in this colony without molestation in the name of Jehovah, their God, forever and ever." Difficulties arose again about 1651, owing to the usurpation of authority by William Coddington, supported by the Massachusetts authorities. Roger Williams, accompanied by John Clarke, pastor of the Newport Baptist church and, next to Williams, the ablest man in the colony, proceeded again to England. Cromwell was now at the head of the government, and they succeeded again in securing the recognition of their claims. After the restoration of the Stuarts, it was thought best to secure a royal charter and thus to put the colony on a footing of complete equality with Massachusetts. There can be little doubt that Roger Williams receded somewhat from the radical position respecting charters that had occasioned so much trouble in his early New England career. He attached chief importance to the title to the lands of the colony that he had received directly from the native chiefs; but he did not disdain to secure the further advantages which recognition by the English Government would give. Apologists for the New England theocracy have attempted to make it appear, that even in Roger Williams's colony the rights of conscience were not strictly guarded, and that penalties were inflicted for substantially the same class of offences as those for which Williams was banished. A careful examination of the cases alleged in support of this contention will show that the distinction between civil and religious offences was ever carefully guarded by Roger Williams. At the same time it must be admitted that when the responsibilities rested upon him of dealing practically with disturbers of the peace, who sought to make their religious convictions an excuse for ignoring civil regulations thought to be necessary for the well-being of the community, he felt the necessity of guarding against unwarranted applications of the doctrine of liberty of conscience. It is only fair that, side by side with the statements of this great principle, we should place his own statement as to the proper application of the principle, made in the light of a long and trying experience: "That ever I should speak or write a tittle that tends to such infinite liberty of conscience, is a mistake which I have ever disclaimed and abhorred. To prevent such mistakes, I at present shall only propose this case: There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth. . . . It hath fallen out sometimes, that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal, I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for, turns upon these two hinges; that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship, or compelled from their own particular prayers or worship, if they practice any. I further add, that I never denied that, notwithstanding this liberty, the commander of this ship ought to command the ship's course; yea, and also to command that justice, peace, and sobriety be kept and practised, both among the seamen and all the passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their service, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help, in person or purse, toward the common charges or defence; if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship, concerning their common peace or preservation; if any shall mutiny and rise up against their commanders and officers; if any shall preach or write that there ought to be no commanders or officers, because all are equal in Christ, therefore no masters or officers, no laws nor orders, no corrections nor punishments; I say I never denied, but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel, and punish such transgressors, according to their deserts and merits."

We must next examine briefly Roger Williams's relation to the Baptists. The great principle of absolute liberty of conscience, that had been advocated by Baptists for over a hundred years, he adopted, wrought out in all its consequences, and put in practice in the colony which he founded. The principle of absolute separatism seemed to him to involve the Baptist position. He believed that the prelatical Church of England was an apostate Church, that true believers should have no fellowship whatever with this Church. He repudiated with the utmost decision the ordinances administered by and in this apostate Church, as well as its worship and teachings. He insisted with vehemence on regenerate church-membership. His repudiation of the Church of England involved, from his point of view, the repudiation of the baptism that he and others had received in this communion. His insistence of regenerate membership involved the rejection of infant baptism. Having become convinced that these consequences were involved in his position, he was too faithful to his convictions not to go where logic led. Accordingly, early in 1638, two years after his banishment, he repudiated the baptism he had received in infancy, and was immersed by Ezekiel Holliman, who before he left

Massachusetts had shown a strong inclination towards Baptist principles and practices. Williams proceeded to baptize Holliman and eleven others. Thus was founded the first Baptist church in the New World. It is a matter of regret to Baptists that Roger Williams was not able to rest in what he had done. In a few months the conviction had grown upon him that this new introduction of believers' baptism was unwarranted. He believed that the ordinances had been lost by the apostasy of the Church during many centuries, and that being thus lost, it was not incumbent upon believers to restore them without a special commission so to do. He seems to have hoped that at some time in the future the ordinances would be miraculously restored. He continued on friendly terms with the Baptists, and many years afterward, when a flourishing Baptist church existed at Newport under the leadership of his friend, John Clarke, and the Providence church was still carrying forward its work, he wrote to Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts: "At Seekonk a great many have lately concurred with Mr. John Clarke and our Providence men about the point of a new baptism, and the manner by dipping, and Mr. John Clarke hath been there lately, and Mr. Lucar, and hath dipped them. I believe their practice comes nearer the first practice of our great Founder Christ Jesus than other practices of religion do." This was in 1649. In his old age (1676), in his writing against the Quakers, referring evidently to the Baptists, who by this time had greatly increased in numbers, he says: "After all my search and examinations, and considerations . . . I do profess to believe that some come nearer to the first primitive churches, and the institutions and appointments of Christ Jesus than others; as in many respects, so in that gallant, and heavenly, and fundamental principle of the true matter of a Christian congregation, flock, or society—viz., actual believers, true disciples and converts, living stones, such as can give some account how the grace of God hath appeared unto them, and wrought that heavenly change in them. . . . If my soul could find rest in joining unto any of the churches professing Christ Jesus now extant, I would readily and gladly do it." "The two first principles and foundations of true religion or worship of the true God in Christ," he wrote in 1643, "are repentance from dead works and faith toward God, before the doctrine of baptism or washing and the laying on of hands, which continue the ordinances and practices of worship; the want of which I conceive is the bane of millions of souls in England and all other nations professing to be Christian nations, who are brought by public authority to baptism and fellowship with God in ordinances of worship, before the saving work of repentance and a true turning to God." Thus it appears that he remained a Baptist in everything except in his demand, that could be fulfilled only by a miracle, of divine sanction for the restoration of the ordinances long since hopelessly lost. Had Roger Williams been acquainted with the latest researches in mediæval history, and had he known of the strong current of evangelical life that runs through the ages commonly denominated "dark," he would probably not have been so absolutely sure that the ordinances had been lost, even from his point of view, that demanded apostolic succession as a condition of their validity. But he was manifestly in error in making the validity of ordinances to depend upon any ceremonial qualification of the person administering them: the error of the Donatists in the early ages, and of High Churchmen, Episcopal and Baptist, in modern times.

It would be interesting to record the impressions of his contemporaries, who were mostly his opponents, and the impressions derived from reading his own writings, as to the personal godliness of Roger Williams. Those who opposed him most strenuously could not but love the man and admire his sincerity and utter loyalty to what he believed to be the truth.

An attempt has been made to set forth the real Roger Williams; not an idealized character, but the man as he lived and moved and labored in the wilds of New England more than two hundred years ago. If it has been made to appear, that while he was not a perfect man, and while he fell short of a clear apprehension of truth in some directions, he was one of the most advanced thinkers of an age of prodigious intellectual activity, and was far in advance of his age in his advocacy of absolute civil and religious liberty, the purpose of the writer will have been fulfilled.

A few sentences from George Bancroft, the father of American historiography, may fitly close this sketch. Having given Roger Williams more credit than, in the judgment of the writer, he deserves, "as the first person in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of the liberty of conscience," and having spoken of him as "the harbinger of Milton, the precursor and superior of Jeremy Taylor," he proceeds : " We praise the man who first analyzed the air, or resolved water into its elements, or drew the lightning from the clouds, even though the discoveries may have been as much the fruits of time as of genius. A moral principle has a much wider and nearer influence on human happiness ; nor can any discovery of truth be of more direct benefit to society, than that which establishes a perpetual religious peace, and spreads tranquillity through every community and every bosom. If Copernicus is held in perpetual reverence, because, on his death-bed, he published to the world that the sun is the centre of our system ; if the name of Kepler is preserved in the annals of human excellence for his sagacity in detecting the laws of the planetary motion ; if the genius of Newton has been almost adored for dissecting a ray of light, and weighing heavenly bodies in a balance, let there be for the name of Roger Williams, at least some humble place among those who have advanced moral science and made themselves the benefactors of mankind."

INSPIRATION.

BY THE REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

From *The Oxford Magazine.*

> " Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness : that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work."—2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

THESE words apply primarily to the Old Testament. This appears not only from the fact that at the time when they were written the New Testament was still incomplete, and the writings which existed could hardly have acquired the recognised authority implied in this connection by the Greek term γραφή, but also from considerations arising out of the context. In the preceding verses the Apostle urges Timothy to abide in the things which he has learned, and been assured of, knowing of whom he has learned them, that " from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." The Scriptures which Timothy, " the son of a Jewess which believed," whom Paul " took and circumcised" at Lystra, had known from a babe, could only have been those of the Old Covenant ; and it is for the purpose of enforcing or illustrating the statement that these Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation, that the Apostle proceeds with the words that I have taken as my text : " Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work."

The subject suggested by my text is one on which it is difficult to say anything which has not been said before. I can only invite your attention this morning to some aspects of it which, though they have been often pointed to, are still sometimes overlooked, and which it seems important to bear in mind at the present day.

" Every Scripture inspired of God." What does this expression signify? We inquire in vain for any authoritative answer. The use of the word will not guide us, for no other Biblical writer employs it. Scripture itself supplies no material assistance ; for though the Biblical writers often assert the Divine origin of particular declarations made by them, there is no parallel statement, speaking with greater distinctness, respecting the origin of the Bible as a whole. Our Church in its formularies treats the Scriptures as the authoritative rule of faith, and is careful to emphasise their sufficiency unto salvation : but it has given no definition of inspiration ; and the books constituting Holy Scripture are described solely by the external mark of being canonical, not by any internal character or quality affirmed to inhere in them. Nevertheless men have assumed that they knew, as it were, intuitively what inspiration meant, and what it involved : they have framed theories of its nature accordingly, and have demanded that the Bible should conform to them. Some, for instance, have imagined inspiration to imply the complete suspension of the human personality, so that the inspired agent resembled a flute in the hands of a player. Others. not going quite so far as this, have still not been able to conceive of inspiration, except as determining the very words and letters of the Bible. Everything, these divines have said, written under inspiration is in every particular and in every relation infallible. " The affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, are without any error when the *ipsissima verba* of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense." " A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine but the Scripture claims, and therefore its inspiration in making these claims." The sentences which I have quoted are not indeed from the pen of an Anglican Divine; but they hardly do more than give pointed expression to a feeling which probably has often been shared by members of our own communion. It is important to observe that for the statements contained in them there is no warrant either in the Bible itself, or in the formularies of our Church. They are the speculations of individual theologians, framed upon the basis of *à priori* conceptions respecting what an inspired book must be, the more serious consideration, what its claims and characteristics actually are, being left out of sight altogether. It cannot be too often repeated that the only legitimate method of determining what is involved in the idea of inspiration, or under what conditions it manifests itself, is by an examination of the books that are described as inspired, and an impartial study of the facts presented by them. The Scriptures nowhere make the claim of absolute and universal inerrancy. And the characteristics of the books comprising them are in many cases very different from those which would naturally be inferred from the first of the statements which I have just read.

Without pretending to define inspiration, or to determine the mystery of its operation, we may, I suppose, say that what we mean by it is an influence which gave to those who received it a unique and extraordinary *spiritual insight*, enabling them thereby, without superseding or suppressing the human faculties, but rather using them as its instruments, to declare in different degrees, and in accordance with the needs or circumstances of particular ages or particular occasions, the mind and purpose of God. Every true and noble thought of man is indeed, in a sense, inspired of God; but with the Biblical writers the purifying and illumining Spirit must have been present in some special and exceptional measure. Nevertheless, in the words of the prophet, or other inspired writer, there is a human element, not less than a Divine element, and neither of these must be ignored. I need not pause in this place for the purpose of emphasising the Divine element in Scripture: it is manifest to all. The "heavenliness of the matter"—to use the expressive phrase of the Westminster Confession—speaks in it with a clearness which none can mistake, and strikes a responsive chord in every heart that is open to receive a message from above. In the Old Testament we read how God awakened in His ancient people of Israel the consciousness of Himself: and we hear one writer after another unfolding different aspects of His nature, and disclosing with increasing distinctness His gracious purposes towards man. In the pages of the prophets there shine forth with ineffable lustre, those sublime declarations of truth and righteousness and judgment which have impressed all readers, to whatever age or clime or creed they have belonged. In the Psalms we hear the meditations of the believing soul, contemplating with adoring wonder the manifold operations of Providence, or pouring forth its emotions in converse with God. The historians set before us, from different points of view, the successive stages in the Divine education of the race. They show us how its natural tendencies to polytheism were gradually overcome. They show us how Israel was more and more separated from its neighbours, in order to be the effectual witness and keeper of Divine truth. Sin is indeed so deeply rooted in human nature that its extirpation upon this earth is not to be expected; but the writers of the Old Testament explain to us how the ordinances of Israel were adapted to counteract its influence, and to maintain a right attitude of the heart towards God. And they interpret further their nation's history: they show us how a providential purpose dominates it; how it is subservient to God's aims; how the past leads on to better possibilities in the present; how the present points to still better possibilities in the future. And the crown and consummation of Israel's long and chequered past is set before us in the pages of the New Testament. In order to realise what the Bible is, we have but to imagine what the literature of Israel would have been, had not those to whom we owe it been illumined in some special measure by the light from heaven: even though its external history had been approximately the same, its historians, its statesmen, its essayists, its poets, would assuredly have written in a very different strain.

But though the greatness and the spiritual importance of the Divine element in Scripture has often and rightly engrossed men's attention, still, in order properly to estimate the character of the book which is termed inspired, or the revelation as we actually possess it, the human element must not be overlooked. Not only is Divine truth always presented through the human organ, and is thus, so to say, coloured by the individuality of the inspired agent by whom it is enunciated, but it is impossible to close our eyes to the fact that its enunciations are sometimes relative rather than absolute; they are adapted to the circumstances of particular ages, they may even be limited by the spiritual capacity of the particular writer, or, in the case of his being a historian, by the materials or sources of information which he had at his disposal. The revelation of the Old Testament is avowedly progressive: the teaching in its earlier parts may naturally therefore be expected to be imperfect as compared with that which is given in its later parts, or which is to be found in the New Testament. We cannot take at random a passage from the inspired volume and say, without qualification or comparison with other passages, that it is absolute truth, or the pure word of God, or an infallible guide to conduct or character.

One or two illustrations will explain what I have in view. In the Book of Job we have a picture of the trial of the pious sufferer. Job, the patriarch of integrity and piety, is subjected to an unexampled succession of calamities. Under the weight of them he bursts forth into passionate imprecations, complaining bitterly of the misery of his lot. His friends, whose theory of life can only account for suffering as caused by some antecedent sin, accuse him wrongfully of grave offences against God and man. The patriarch, goaded to desperation by the combined severity of his sufferings and the cruel taunts of his friends, loses control of himself: he charges the Almighty with persecuting him maliciously, with treating him wilfully as guilty while He knows him to be innocent (x. 6, 7), with even governing the world at large as an arbitrary and unjust despot (ix. 22–24; ch. xxi.). Clearly we cannot here treat the misapplied truths placed in the mouths of the friends, or the impious sentences hurled by Job against the Almighty, as the absolute word or teaching of God. The parts of the Book of Job must be read in the light supplied by the whole: the inspiration of the poem is to be found in the manner in which the theme chosen by the poet is developed, and in the lessons which are deducible from the work as a whole. The Book of Job, treated as a whole, declares more than one great truth of God's government of the world, but it contains many particular statements, of which inerrancy cannot, in any reasonable sense of the term, be predicated.

The relativity of inspiration is observable again very noticeably in the Book of Ecclesiastes. The melancholy conclusion to which the author's moralisings lead him is that life under all its aspects is dissatisfying and disappointing; the best that can be done with it is to enjoy, while it lasts, such pleasures as it brings with it. "There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good in his labour" (ii. 24). How strangely these words fall upon our ears! How unlike the soaring aspirations of the Psalmists, or the spirit of generous philanthropy which breathes so often in the discourses of the great prophets, or the exhortations of the law! The teaching of Ecclesiastes, if followed consistently, could only result in paralysing human effort, in stifling every impulse of an ennobling or unselfish kind. The author's theory of life is imperfect; untoward and depressing circumstances, as it seems, embittered his spirit, and concealed from him a fuller and more satisfying view of the sphere of human activity. His conclusions possess only a relative value. It is upon life not absolutely, but as he witnessed and experienced it, that he passes his remorseless verdict "all is vanity." It was the particular age with which he was himself acquainted that prompted him to judge as he did of the uselessness of human endeavour; and his maxims, at least so far as they possess a negative aspect, cannot be applied to a different age without material qualification and reserve.

Even in the Psalms the same fact strikes us. Profound as the spirituality of the Psalms commonly is, and adequate as their language nearly at all times is to give words to the deepest religious emotions of the devout Christian, it is undeniable that passages occur in the Psalter which seem to him to strike a discordant note. It is not my intention this morning to dilate upon the so-called imprecatory Psalms, or to review the various explanations and excuses which have been offered for their presence in the Psalter: after all has been said, it must be acknowledged, in the words of the most recent commentator on the Psalms, that these utterances "belong to the spirit of the Old Testament, and not of the New Testament, and by it they must be judged." Nor, though this is sometimes overlooked, do they stand alone in the Old Testament: Jeremiah more than once breaks out into invocations of vengeance against his personal enemies, which differ in no substantial respect from those which we read in the Book of Psalms (cf. Jer. xviii. 21, 23). And exquisite as is the pathos which breathes in the 137th Psalm, as the poet contrasts the land of his exile with his beloved ancestral home, do we not all feel the difference between his closing verse, "Happy shall he be that taketh thy little ones and dasheth them against the stones," and the words of that other Psalmist who wrote, "I will make mention of Rahab and Babylon as them that know me?" It is plain that there exist declarations in the Bible which are not free from the tinge of human infirmity and human passion. But abundant as are the evidences of the elevating and sanctifying work of the Spirit of God upon the writers in both Testaments, we have no antecedent right to suppose that every writer is in precisely the same degree subordinated to it. Neither Scripture itself, nor the judgment of the Church, authorises us to affirm that every statement, or even every book, stands upon the same moral or religious plane, or is in the same measure the expression of the Divine mind: the influences of time and place, of circumstances and situation, of scope and aim, of temper and opportunity, must all be taken into account, before we can rightly judge of the precise sense in which parts of Scripture are to be regarded as the word of God, and of the precise degree in which they individually claim to be authoritative.

So also there are phenomena in the historical books which are inconsistent with *à priori* theories of inspiration, as well as with hard and fast definitions of the Word of God. If there is a subject on which precision of statement might antecedently be expected, it is surely in the record of the discourses of Christ. Yet here, while there are ample independent reasons (on which I cannot now dwell) for holding that in all essentials they have been transmitted to us faithfully, in matters of verbal exactitude no small freedom has been permitted. In the Synoptic Gospels, sayings of our Lord, in origin and occasion manifestly the same, are often presented in a more or less divergent literary form: St. Luke in particular appears to have been apt to partially recast both the narratives and the discourses which reached him, and to accommodate them to his own style. In the disposition of their materials also the Evangelists sometimes differ remarkably: matter, and to all appearance the same matter, which in one Gospel is aggregated, in another is found dispersed. The combination of resemblances and differences in the Synoptic Gospels is a most singular literary feature; and its explanation constitutes a problem of great complexity, in which, though certain fixed points appear to have been gained, much still remains uncertain. But whatever solution be adopted, or even though the problem be insoluble, it is manifest that *some* editorial modification and adjustment of the material has taken place in each. And in the Fourth Gospel, a comparison with the Synoptics on the one hand, and with the Epistles of St. John on the other, makes it impossible to doubt that the actual words of Christ have often been transfused into the individuality of the Evangelist, and reshaped in his own phraseology.* So far, even in the most sacred parts of Scripture, is the truthfulness of the picture, as a whole, dissociated from the mechanical correctness of its individual parts, and made independent either of the chronological precision of the annalist, or of the verbal exactitude of the stenographist.

Nor does the Old Testament teach a different lesson. Compilation, diversity of origin, variety of motive and standpoint, are the characteristics which disclose themselves when the historical books are examined with sufficient minuteness and care. Traditions, shaped partly by oral transmission, partly by the hand of the narrator, rather than the immediate testimony of eyewitnesses, are what, it is difficult to doubt, are here sometimes presented to us. Dramatic personification, which in a more or less mature form has held such a prominent and often such an important place in the literature of the world, is seen also to be not unrepresented in the Old Testament. Why should it not be so? Why should modes and styles of composition which, except by extreme Puritans, have always been recognised as the legitimate vehicle of human thought, as well as a powerful instrument of education, be excluded from the consecrating influence of the spirit of God? If the imagination be a faculty granted by God to man, and capable, as all must allow, of being employed in instruction and edification, why, where no fact, conditioning a theological verity, is concerned, may it not have been subordinated to the Divine plan for the spiritual advancement of the race? Where nothing is defined as to the nature or the limits of the inspiring Spirit's work, with what justice are particular spheres to be excluded, as it were upon principle, from the range of its operation? Do not the opening words of the Epistle to the Hebrews authorise us to expect variety of degree, not less than variety of form, in the manifestation of Himself which God made through the writers of the older dispensation? Through the history of Israel as a nation, through the lives of its representative men, and through the varied forms of its national literature, God has revealed Himself to the world. But this revelation was not made in its completeness at a single moment: it was subjected externally to the conditions which govern human history; it advanced progressively; and it is not more than consonant with the idea of progress that at each stage it should be regulated by the opportunities, and adapted to the capabilities, of those to whom it was primarily addressed.

---

* Comp. Watkins, *Bampton Lectures* (1890), p. 426 f.; Sanday, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 73 f., 128-130, 222 f.; and in *The Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1891, p. 536, 538 f. (reprinted in the November number of this magazine), and *The Expositor*, Nov. 1891, p. 333 ff.

Nothing is more destructive of the just claims of Christianity than a false theory of inspiration: nothing has led to more fatal shipwrecks of faith than the acceptance in youth of *à priori* views of what an inspired book must be, which the study of maturer years has demonstrated only too cogently to be untrue to fact. It needs, indeed, less than the "proved error" to confute "our doctrine:" how wide an interval separates that doctrine from the "Scripture claims" with which it has been so complacently and yet so naively identified, is not alas! always perceived. Let us, while we adhere firmly to the *fact* of inspiration, refrain from defining, and especially from limiting, the range or mode of its operation, until we have familiarised ourselves, as well as may be, with the varied contents, and with the often remarkable relations subsisting between the different parts of the volume which we term inspired. When we have done this it will hardly fail but that our conception of its scope will be broadened and enlarged. It seems, indeed, to be sometimes apprehended that if any modification be allowed in the popular conception of an inspired work, men's respect for the Bible will be impaired. The apprehension, though the feeling which prompts it may be sympathised with and appreciated, is surely a mistaken one. Men's respect for the Bible will be most securely won, and its authority most effectually established, by the truth about it being set before them, and by claims not being raised on its behalf *which it does not raise itself*. Men's respect for it, it is to be feared, is sometimes sadly diminished by the forced and unnatural expedients to which apologists have resorted, for the purpose of reconciling the facts which the Bible actually presents with those which, according to their own theory of its origin and contents, ought to be found in it. Shall we not do well to remember Hooker's caution: "As incredible praises given to men do often abate and impair the credit of the deserved commendation, so we must likewise take great heed lest by attributing to Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which indeed it hath abundantly to be less reverently esteemed?" *

It may be doubted from this point of view whether the common use of the expression, "Word of God," as a term descriptive of the entire Bible, does not sometimes give rise to misunderstanding. To say nothing of the uncertainties of transmission, translation, and interpretation, involved in many passages, the identification of both, which it virtually implies, leaves out of sight that important aspect of the whole truth that the message from God which the Bible brings to man is always mediated through a human channel: it tends to generate a confusion between the Divine thought and the human imagery, or human form of composition, under which it is presented. The figurative language of the prophets, or the imaginative presentation of a great truth in a book like the poem of Job, will illustrate what I mean. Applied to the Bible, as a whole, the expression, "Word of God," seems to savour of the old theory of inspiration, which no one now cares to maintain, according to which the Holy Ghost dictated to the Biblical writers the very terms which they were to use: it seems to place every part of the Bible upon precisely the same spiritual level: it seems to imply an absoluteness, a finality, a perfection, which, as the instances that I have referred to sufficiently show, do not inhere in every particular statement which Scripture contains. No doubt the term could be so defined as to make it coextensive with the whole Bible; but there would always be the danger of the technical definition being forgotten, and the popular acceptation being substituted for it. And it should be carefully remembered that this use of the term is not Biblical. In the Old Testament the term "Word of God" is applied chiefly to particular declarations of the purposes or promises of God, especially to those made by the prophets: in the New Testament it denotes commonly the gospel message, the tidings of salvation proclaimed first upon the lips of the Saviour, carried afterwards by His apostles to different quarters of the globe. But it is never applied to the historical books (of either Testament), or to the Wisdom literature, or even to the Psalms. We are thus not in a position to say whether the Biblical writers themselves would have so applied it. It is certain that no historical writer claims to draw his information from a supernatural source ; and it is at least worthy of consideration whether the *record* of a revelation, though legitimately termed "inspired," is itself legitimately regarded as identical with the "Word of God." In the official formularies of our Church there is an elasticity in the use of the expression, in strict conformity with Biblical usage—as when the priest is described not by the mechanical term of *reader*, but as the Dispenser or Preacher of God's word—which shows that it must not be treated as if it denoted solely or principally a given collection of written statements, but that it properly denotes the message sent by God to man, which may be translated into very different forms, and modified, in external representation, to suit the needs of different occasions. I venture to think that, especially in dealing with persons of limited education, it would be judicious to exercise some reserve in the use of this term, and to prefer modes of expression which, while not less just to fact, might be less open to misconstruction.

---

* *Eccl. Pol.* II. viii. 7.

But I have left unnoticed what is really the primary affirmation of my text. The context in any case, and, if the Revised Version be adopted, the terms of the text itself, show that the point which the Apostle desires to emphasise is not the particular sense in which he held the Old Testament Scriptures to be inspired, but the practical teaching to be derived from them. "But abide thou in the things that thou hast learned, knowing . . . that from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness ; that the man of God may be complete, completely furnished unto every good work." The practical value of the Old Testament is not dependent upon a theory of the sense in which it is inspired ; and those who judge the literature of Israel from what may be termed a critical as opposed to a traditional standpoint must dispute the claim, which representatives of the latter seem sometimes to make, that they alone are conscious of the worth of the Old Testament. The Old Testament Scriptures enshrine truths of permanent and universal validity. Motives, precepts, lessons, as serviceable now as they were in a distant past, start up out of its pages. In spite of the special and, it might even be said, narrowing circumstances under which they were nearly all written, in spite of the national sentiment which was a natural, and indeed a necessary, condition of the history of Israel, its great writers continually rise above all the limiting influences of time or place, and proclaim truths respecting God and man, which, as they constituted the foundation upon which the Christian faith was reared, so they have now been made the priceless and inalienable possession of humanity. We hear in the Old Testament exhortations to righteousness, and the rebuke of sin. We have set before us types for our imitation, and examples for our warning. We learn truths from it which we might in vain seek to discover for ourselves, the counsels of our Heavenly Father for the guidance of His children, the temper and frame of mind by which He would have them respond to His call. In manifold tones the Voice of God speaks to us from its pages. The Scriptures of the Old Testament are the record of a revelation, having the practical aim of raising men's thoughts towards heaven, and prompting them to righteousness and holiness of life, "that the man of God may be complete, completely furnished unto every good work." They may not exhibit the characteristics which theologians have sometimes pictured them as possessing ; but if we go to them in search of the word of God, we shall infallibly find it. May we so read them that they may exert upon us the effect for which St. Paul impressed the study of them upon Timothy ! May they help to furnish us completely unto every good work, and to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus !

ANCIENT BELIEFS IN IMMORTALITY.

A Reply to Mr. Gladstone.*

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR CHEYNE.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), December, 1891.

The author of the article on 'Ancient Beliefs in a Future State' in the October number of this Review has so many titles to one's respect that it is with regret that

---

* Mr. Gladstone's article was reprinted in the November number of this magazine.

I even seem to place myself in opposition to him. I am sure, however, that he will not misinterpret the freedom which I take, and that were I to offer him exemption from criticism, his eager mind and generous character would not allow him to accept it. Moreover, to say the truth, Mr. Gladstone has several times of late courted criticism. Not only in his *Landmarks of Homeric Study,* but in a thoughtful and deeply earnest work on the study of the Bible, he runs counter to the prevailing tendency of modern research, and though there has been, perhaps, not much reply, at any rate from Biblical scholars, it is certainly not for want of opportunity. Still, I should not have troubled the reader with these remarks but for the circumstance that the article referred to has, on the one hand, given me credit for that which I have not done, and which it passes the ability of scholarship to do, and, on the other, passed over both what I may fairly claim to have proved and what I hope to have made in a high degree probable ; it also appears to me to convey a thoroughly wrong impression of my treatment of the subject before us. I am sure that this is due to mere inadvertence. Mr. Gladstone simply acts like the great lay preacher that he is in seeking a brief and pointed text for his discourse, and if he selects one from an article of my own in a little-known Indian periodical,[*] I ought to feel myself honoured. And so I should, if this eminent writer, whose interest in the work of Oxford men for India gratifies me, had not first of all, in the manner of many text-without-context-quoting clerical preachers, misapprehended the meaning of his text, and then, unlike the preachers referred to, most urbanely but resolutely pulled his misapprehended text to pieces.

Perhaps, in justice to myself, I ought to point out that in the writings mentioned below[†] Mr. Gladstone would have found a much fuller statement of my case than in my popular article. The principal one is, in fact, referred to as forthcoming in the *Indian Church Quarterly*, but Mr. Gladstone had not time to seek it out. I will now quote some of my critic's introductory words :—

> It is the opinion of Professor Cheyne that there is a doctrine of immortality in the Old Testament. He finds it in Psalms xvi., xvii., xxxvi., xlix., lxiii., lxxiii. He thinks he has proved that these psalms were composed 'during the latter part of the Persian rule over Palestine.' In the Review, however, he does not enter upon the date of these psalms, but states a principle which serves as a convenient text for a discussion of the subject touched by it. The principle is this : 'It involves a much greater strain upon faith to hold that the wonderful intuition of immortality was granted so early as the times of David and Solomon, than to bring the psalms in question down to the late Persian age.'

To this 'convenient text' Mr. Gladstone subjoins this comment :—

> The general doctrine which appears to be here conveyed is to something like the following effect : that the human race advances through experience, heredity, and tradition, from infancy towards maturity ; that the mind, subjected to these educative influences, undergoes a process of expansion, and becomes capable, in a later age, of accepting intelligently what, in an earlier age, it could not have been fit to receive. In my opinion, such a doctrine requires an important qualification ; because moral elements, as well as those which are intellectual, go to form our capability of profitable reception, &c. (p. 658).

Later on he says (I omit for the present the two questions on page 663) :—

> For those who suppose [the psalms mentioned above] to have belonged to the worship of the Solomonic temple, and who are glad to follow Professor Cheyne when he proves that they embody the hope of a future life, it would be somewhat anomalous to believe that, while the public service taught this doctrine, no mark of it had been left, outside the temple-walls, upon the historical books of the Old Testament, or in the sense of the people (p. 664).

And after completing his examination of the narrative books of the Old Testament, he puts forward the theory, in opposition, as he conceives, to my own, that what I have called a 'great strain upon faith' 'seems to have been put upon the Egyptians and the Iranians at a very early age indeed' (p. 673).

Up to a certain point, therefore, Mr. Gladstone avails himself of my help. I have, as he is willing to believe, 'proved' that Psalms xvi., xvii., xxxvi., xlix., lxiii., lxxiii., 'embody the hope of a future life.' My critic disagrees with me, however, as to the date of these liturgical compositions, which he refers, not to the latter part of the Persian age, but to the age of David and Solomon (pp. 663, 664). He apparently thinks, moreover, that I have been blind to the high religious attainments of sections of the human race before the time of David, and that I believe 'the idea of immortality' to have been 'made known to the Hebrews from Persian sources' (p. 663), having rashly ignored the evidence bearing on Jewish belief in a future life before the Persian age—in short, that I am an adherent of a somewhat crude form (which is described on p. 658) of the historical doctrine of development.

---

[*] *The Indian Church Quarterly Review*, April 1891. Article. 'The Biblical Doctrine of Immortality.

[†] *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions* (Bampton Lectures for 1889), 1891.

Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Ancient Israel,' two public lectures delivered at Oxford ; see *Expository Times*, June, July, and August, 1891. If I am not mistaken, mine is the first attempt, on the theological side, to reconsider the relation of Judaism to Zoroastrianism on the basis of the texts and of the actually leading authorities. The necessities of criticism led me to make it ; for it is clear enough that no part of the Old Testament will yield the secret of its origin to an unassisted literary analysis. Whenever Zend scholarship was needed, I was able to apply to a learned specialist, Dr. Mills.

Let me with due modesty compare Mr. Gladstone's statements and implications with facts. Have I anywhere claimed to have proved on purely linguistic or exegetical grounds that six of the psalms 'embody the hope of a future life'? By no means. The greatest linguist or interpreter in the world could not do this; the old dogmatic certainty as to the one clear prophetically Christian meaning of the psalms has for ever passed away. What I have said, both in my article and elsewhere, is this—that there are passages in the six psalms referred to which may, without straining language, be considered to give a vague untheological expression to this great hope, on condition that these psalms can be shown, on grounds both philological and in the larger sense critical, to be of the post-Exilic, and, more precisely, of the late Persian or early Greek period. Mr. Gladstone will see that he has no right to take one part of my theory and to leave the other. If these six psalms are of the pre-Exilic or of the early post Exilic period, then we simply cannot, according to my theory, interpret them as containing foregleams of the faith in spiritual immortality. If, however, they are of the latter part of the Persian age, when the direct and indirect influence of Zoroastrian ideas upon the Jews must have been considerable, we may.

Next, have I been blind to the higher elements in ethnic religions before the time of David? On the contrary. References to such elements in Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian religions are wanting in few of my writings, while references to the religion of Zarathustra are prominent in the latest (including of course the article in question). To look for the same higher religious elements in the Homeric poems would have seemed to me an historical paradox, but I have expressly said that 'half the sympathy which we bring to the Psalter would reveal unsuspected beauties in the [upon any critical hypothesis] much older sacred songs of Chaldæa,'* and if I did not mention Egypt in this connection, it was only because 'Egyptian religion has not the elementary affinities with the Israelitish which are possessed by that of Mesopotamia.'* And how is it possible that my courteous critic should have brought the next charge against me—that I represent the Hebrews as having borrowed the idea of immortality from Persia? Why, I have expressly guarded myself against this very misapprehension. 'My view' (the words are taken from my article) 'is *not* that the psalmists borrowed from Zoroastrianism, but that the example of this faith stimulated Jewish prophets and psalmists to expand their own germs of truth.'† And upon turning to my *Bampton Lectures* Mr. Gladstone will find that Part I. of Lecture VI. bears this heading, 'The Religious Ideas of the Psalter not borrowed,' and that Part II. of Lecture VIII. carries out the theory already promulgated with special reference to the idea of immortality. If there is a more frank discussion of this subject anywhere, I shall be most thankful to learn from it. Meantime I will only quote a short passage from a published academical lecture which has escaped Mr. Gladstone's attention:—

'Both Babylon and Persia may, under God, have helped forward their growth, but they existed potentially among the Israelites in germs which had, to a certain extent, an inherent power of development. The hypothesis of borrowed beliefs is an easy but not always a very critical one, and it appears to me, in cases like the present, to be inconsistent with the policy of Israel's church-leaders, who felt that the originality of their own religion would be endangered by too large an admixture of elements of foreign origin. . . . The influence exerted upon them was not that of a master upon a slave, but that of one disciple of the true God upon another. Israel, though the destined leader of religious progress, was comparatively slow in his development; was there any reason why he should not receive, not indeed entirely fresh intuitions, but stimulus to thought, and, it may be, sometimes even forms of theological expression, from without?'‡

It is, I submit, very unfair to my theory (which affirms a native Hebrew movement in the post-Exilic period in a Zoroastrian direction, and admits the controlling influence of the Divine Spirit) to describe it as Mr. Gladstone has done in his article. And in conclusion, viewing all the evidence together, it is surely an error in judgment to impute to me the crude development hypothesis (which leaves no room for prophets) described on page 658.

---

* *Bampton Lectures*, 1889, p. 267.

* *The Book of Psalms*, 'Parchment Library' version, Introd. p. x.

† *Indian Church Quarterly Review*, April 1891, p. 137.

‡ 'Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel, Part I. *Expository Times*, June 1891, p. 203.

I hope that I have thus made two points sufficiently clear. First, that the 'text' which Mr. Gladstone has borrowed from me is not at all a 'convenient' one; and next, that, except with regard to the date of the six psalms, he has not accurately represented my teaching. I know full well how my critic will feel: to a noble conscience, as his own poet says, 'how bitter a sting is trivial fault!'[*] He will certainly regret these mistakes, and will bear with me if, in the interests of truth, I endeavour to account for them. It might at first be supposed that there was something in the style of my article which lent itself to misapprehension. On consideration, however, this idea must be abandoned. In addressing the sensitive clerical public of the *Indian Church Quarterly*, the utmost simplicity of style was indispensable, and was in fact employed. No; Mr. Gladstone's difficulty in reading my article must have lain below the words—in the ideas. A free but profoundly devout criticism of the Old Testament was a novelty to him—accepted, we may hope, as a fact, but not comprehended in all its bearings. How, indeed, could Mr. Gladstone trust a criticism which was partly of rationalistic origin, and which, according to its enemies, still looked for directions to Germany? And how could Biblical scholars, who, as was supposed, were but apt pupils of this or that leading German critic, have anything fresh to say about the Psalms after Reuss and Wellhausen?[†] Mr. Gladstone therefore contented himself with dipping into my unlucky article, not supposing that I had given the first comprehensive study of the origin and religious contents of the Psalter both from the point of view of advanced criticism and from that of the history of religions. I do not, however, find fault with Mr. Gladstone, for, as Dante's Statius says, 'oftentimes do things appear which give false material for doubting,'[‡] and I hope that he may realise in himself that other high saying of Dante's Beatrice, that 'doubt springs up, in fashion of a shoot, at the foot of truth.'[*]

Meantime I will venture to indicate some doubtful points in Mr. Gladstone's essay which 'Statius' may perhaps be able to explain. There is a weak point in the essay to which the author's delicately-veiled criticism of myself on p. 658 has opened my eyes. He is evidently fascinated by social and religious ideas, and delights in the literary expression which they have found. He has also a strong interest in prophets and revealers, but I miss any clear perception of the great historical principle of development. I will not quarrel with him for objecting to this or that theoretic form of the principle, but I do desire to see the principle itself distinctly recognised. It must be in consequence of this deficiency that Mr. Gladstone fails to realise what the references to a 'future state' in the admittedly older Scriptures mean. He constantly speaks as if the popular belief in Sheól were equivalent to a belief in immortality, and even thinks it worth while to show that 'the people [of Israel] did not fall so low in the scale either of nature or of grace as to suppose that the life of man is at an end when his remains are laid in the ground' (p. 666). To this point I must return later; I now proceed to remark upon Mr. Gladstone's historical method. There is, it seems to me, one essential requirement in point of method which he does not satisfy. No one surely ought to discuss 'ancient beliefs in a future state' without a (so far as possible) first-hand knowledge of the ancient authorities and a critical examination of their dates. Now the authorities which I find adduced in Mr. Gladstone's essay are not ancient at all, except in the case of the Greek and Hebrew writings (*i.e.* the Greek Homer and Herodotus and the English Old Testament). Canon Rawlinson's *Ancient Religions* and George Smith's *Assyrian Discoveries*, Sir Gardner Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (first published in 1837–41), Haug's *Essays on the Sacred Languaye, &c., of the Parsees* (first published in 1862), and Duncker's *History of Antiquity*, certainly do not supply an adequate basis for the discussion of our subject. The ancient books and inscriptions themselves (in the best translations) ought in the first instance to have been consulted, and then recourse should have been had to the most recent leading specialists, such as Brugsch, Maspero, Renouf, Schrader, Delitzsch, Sayce, Pinches, Haupt, Winckler,

---

[*] Dante, *Purgatory*, iii. 8, 9.

[†] I mention the former because his able and interesting popular work on the Psalms has a position in England which would surprise German scholars (see *e.g.*, Bishop Alexander's *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*), and the latter because of a reference made to him by Mr. Gladstone in his *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*. If Wellhausen should some day enter into a critical discussion of the Psalter, his English colleagues will no doubt listen to him with keen interest. But it is at present a mistake to connect the name of Wellhausen specially with the Psalter.

[‡] Dante, *Purgatory*, xxii. 28–30.

[*] Dante, *Paradise*, iv. 130–132.

Darmesteter, Mills, Spiegel, Geldner. And there is another defect which I venture respectfully to point out. It was unwise to admit Egypt (fascinating as all Egyptian things are) within the range of comparison, partly because there is still so much divergence of opinion on the course of Egyptian religion, and partly because of the fundamental contrast between Egyptian pantheism and Jewish theism. I may add that there is in my judgment no period at which a close historical connection between the Egyptian and the Jewish beliefs can be safely presumed.[*]

It is equally doubtful whether the beliefs of early Greece deserved to be so prominently mentioned. Mr. Gladstone himself suggests that the conception of the Underworld in the *Odyssey* contains many 'exotic' elements, and boldly traces the story of Ganymêdes in the *Iliad* to a Hebrew origin (pp. 662, 665). Would it not have been better to devote any surplus of space to some interesting phenomena of the later popular beliefs of the Greeks? Not, of course, that these are historically connected with the beliefs of the Israelites, but the development of the Greek belief in immortality may very possibly throw light upon that of the analogous Jewish (and Christian) belief. I could wish at any rate that Mr. Gladstone had made some honourable mention of Pindar. As a preserver and a sanctifier of traditional stories, this noble poet strikingly resembles the old Hebrew narrators of the school of the prophets;[†] in his view of the things after death he is even, from a Christian point of view, superior to them. 'I will go down to Sheól to my son mourning,' says Jacob (Gen. xxxvii. 35); the narrator has no more idea either of an earthly or of a heavenly Paradise awaiting the righteous than the author of the Exilic or early post-Exilic poem of Job. In Pindar's second Olympic, however, we certainly find the belief in future retribution,[‡] and in one of the fragments of the Dirges we have that remarkable passage, the prelude of later spiritualism:—

καὶ σῶμα μὲν πάντων ἕπεται θανάτῳ περισθενεῖ,
ζωὸν δ' ἔτι λείπεται αἰῶνος εἴδωλον· τὸ γάρ ἐστι μόνον ἐκ θεῶν.[*]

Even if he had mentioned nothing else, Mr. Gladstone surely might have supplemented *Il.* xx. 232–235 by Pind. *Ol.* i. 41–46, where Pelops and Ganymêdes share the same heavenly honours. Had my critic hit upon this combination, he might perhaps have seen reason to think that the Homeric stories of Ganymêdes and Menelaus (*Od.* iv. 569) are chiefly valuable as affording fresh evidence for the widespread early belief that some fortunate men might even escape the common lot of souls. In these stories would seem to be the germ, not indeed of the cult of the 'heroes' which, by the time of the Persian wars, had attained such vast dimensions, but at any rate of that glorification of the lot of the virtuous dead which connected itself with that cult in later times. Immortality in the early ages of Greece was an aristocratic privilege; in the later times (not surely in all respects times of decadence) it was thrown open to the common people.[†] Will Mr. Gladstone permit me to think that religious belief took a similar course (not indeed without one important divergence) in Palestine? I fear not. Yet Professor Mozley said, as long ago as 1877, that 'if one had to describe shortly the defect of recent criticism upon the Old Testament, one would say that it did not make allowance for the necessities of a progressive revelation.'[‡] This great Anglican divine was referring no doubt to the older rationalism, but his words may be worth pondering, even by those who are most opposed to that form of thought.

I pass on to my critic's treatment of the evidence supplied by the Old Testament. He thinks that 'the doctrine of a future state,' though it 'nowhere entered into the prescriptions of the Mosaic law, and is not directly declared and inculcated in the earliest Scriptures,' yet 'probably subsisted among the Hebrews as a private opinion' (p. 669). But he also believes, as appears from a passage on p. 664 quoted above (p. 952), that 'the public service taught this doctrine' in the six temple-hymns already mentioned. I do not understand how these two sentences can be reconciled. If the *lex orandi* is the *lex credendi*, surely those who used the psalms in question did not merely express their 'private opinion;' they, in the proper sense of the word, believed in immortality. And if so, surely this belief *did*, 'form a part of those truths which the Jewish people were appointed to maintain and to transmit.' Again: it appears from p. 664 that Mr. Gladstone finds the same faith expressed (1) in Ex. iii. 6, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,' (2) in Gen. v. 24, 'For God took him' (viz. Enoch), (3) in 2 Kings ii. 11, 'And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven,' and (4) in the prohibition of necromancy (Deut. xviii. 11) and the story of the witch of Endor (valuable evidence of popular belief). My critic seems for the moment to forget that Ex. iii. 6, in its strict philological sense, will not bear the interpretation which he, as a devout Christian, puts upon it.[*] But, even were it otherwise, the assumed fact that the three patriarchs, and also Enoch and Elijah, escaped the common lot of souls, cannot prove much as to the existence of the idea of immortality among the Israelites, while the passages referred to under the fourth head distinctly prove that it was practically unknown, at any rate to the people at large. M. Montet's recent article[†] may contain serious errors, but this statement at any rate is true—and I know that the late Professor Mozley would have heartily accepted it—that 'Sheól is the negation of life.' To attempt to refute the theory that the 'intuition of immortality' arose late in Jewish history by pointing to the popular belief in Sheól, is a confession of weakness. The 'intuition' and the 'belief' (I will not call them both by the same name) are wide as the poles asunder. The one is the concentration of all happiness; the other (from an advanced moral point of view), of all misery. The one stimulates to the highest efforts of virtue, the other conduces (as the psalms sufficiently show) to selfish tyranny and practical atheism on the part of the rich, and to an ever-recurring fear and despondency on the part of the poor. Ps. xlix. cannot be fully appreciated till we view it as incidentally (like some passages in the Book of Enoch) a protest against the old Hebrew belief in Sheól.

---

[*] M. Renan, as it appears to me, indulges somewhat too freely in Egyptian illustrations of early Israelitish usages. Still, even if we could accept all or most of his suggestions, it would scarcely oblige me to modify the above statements. The relation between the early Egyptian and the contemporary popular Israelitish religion is altogether different from that between the late Egyptian and the contemporary popular Christian religion. M. Renan himself admits that the early Hebrews would have found Egyptian ideas on the future lot of the soul 'in a high degree unseemly' (*Histoire d'Israël*, i. 130).

[†] The parallel becomes all the closer if, as we are assured, the idea of a future retribution, which was so vital to Æschylus and Pindar, was utterly alien to the contemporary popular belief. These poets had in this case something of the prophetic character, like the great Hebrew narrators.

[‡] Pind. *Ol.* ii. 109–140.

[*] *Fragm.* xcvi. 2–4.

[†] See the evidence collected from the inscriptions by Carl Lehrs, *Aufsätze*, p. 337, &c.; and comp. Weil's review of Rohde's important work, *Psyche*; 'Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen' (Part I.), in the *Journal des Savants*, October 1890.

[‡] *Ruling Ideas of the Early Ages*, p. 80.

Let me turn now to Mr. Gladstone's three theses (p. 660), and state the judgment which I have been led to form of them. The first—that the movement of ideas in the human race was a retrograde and not a forward movement—seems to be not properly an historical but a theological doctrine, and most recent theologians of the Reformed communities, who have been trained in historical principles, would agree in rejecting it. The second—that the belief in a future life worthy of the name, though not prominent even in the psalms, is referred to in some passages of the Old Testament—is true, but is contested by no one. The evidence adduced for it appears, moreover, to be both inaccurate and incomplete. The third—that the Hebrew race had no special mission to proclaim 'the truth concerning a future state,' and that possibly 'more may have been done for its maintenance by certain of the Gentile religions'—is also true, and well deserves to be pressed on the Christian public, though here, too, Mr. Gladstone's facts may need both revision and enlargement, and above all the application of a more critical method. I will ask leave to make but one observation on each of the three theses, and then pass on to two questions which my critic has done me the honour to address to me.

I find it, then, a significant fact that Mr. Gladstone still holds that ancient religion was in some sense dogmatic, *i.e.* that it consisted essentially in a certain 'precious knowledge,' which, as young mankind 'could hardly [why this qualification?] have discovered' it for itself, was graciously imparted to it by the Almighty, that fragments of this primeval revelation are to be found in 'the earliest Scriptures,' and other fragments, in a more or less corrupt state, in the 'Gentile religions.' This was no doubt the 'fittest' to 'survive' of all the theological theories which in the pre-critical period [*] sought to account for the parallelisms between the various religions. It has been treated by Professor Max Müller as antiquated, but it will scarcely become so until a free but devout criticism of the Old Testament is more generally practised by Church theologians.

It is perhaps not less noteworthy that Mr. Gladstone, though he regards the argument of the *Divine Legation* as 'fair and probable' (p. 665), is not favourably inclined (so at least I infer) to Bishop Warburton's critical principles. These were crude enough, no doubt; but they contained the promise of that development which we see going on around us among Christian scholars. The chief historical result to which they led this acute writer was one which few critics of our day would care to deny, viz. that the Jews 'learned the [higher] doctrine of a future state some small time after their thorough re-establishment [in Palestine].'*

---

[*] I am not opposed to developing the spiritual truth latent in these words, and see no reason whatever why the same principle should not be carried out elsewhere in the Old Testament (or in any other literary records), provided that these developments be not used for historical purposes.

[†] *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, October 1890; cf. *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 425, 451, 452.

[*] See, in the seventeenth century, Theophilus Gale, *The Court of the Gentiles*, Thomas Hyde, *Veterum Persarum Religionis Historia*; Lord Herbert of Cherbury, *De Religione Gentilium*.

My third observation will, I hope, be altogether pleasing to my critic. Whereas Bishop Warburton angrily declared that 'not one of that numerous rabble of revelations ever pretended to come from the First Cause, or taught the worship of the one God,' † Mr. Gladstone continues the nobler tradition of Cudworth and Stillingfleet. He evidently believes that the comparative study of religions is not merely a secular science, but a necessary part of theology. One is thankful for Mr. Gladstone's cautiously-expressed opinion, for though the study of religions has long attracted the charmed attention of a few theologians, this has not yet borne much fruit for the Church. The theologians have been almost too timorous, not being aware that there was a growing interest in their subject among the laity. The younger generation, both clerical and lay, is getting bolder. The cry is already heard that a broader and deeper view of inspiration should be more generally preached in our pulpits and taught in our higher schools. The religion of the Bible must no longer be isolated from every other, but its analogies and contrasts to other religions must form part of a religious education. One may venture to hope that Mr. Gladstone will not be repelled by these demands, which recognise the element of truth in his own long-cherished theory of a primeval revelation, and the granting of which can but contribute to a bolder and a stronger faith.

Before passing to Mr. Gladstone's two questions, I will only remark that, from his triumphant tone, he hardly appears to realise the seriousness with which historical theologians regard their duties. He seems to look upon them as well-meaning theorists, who have no sound practical judgment and little intellectual grasp, and who amuse themselves with fancies, of which a vigorous common-sense will soon disclose the emptiness. At any rate, this is one of the current estimates of the newer theology, and it cannot but exercise a certain influence upon the theologians themselves. For popularity is always grateful, and they would certainly please many outside critics better by eschewing comprehensive theorising and withdrawing into the domain of so-called facts. Now there can be no objection whatever to the collection of facts; indeed, the newer theology is distinguished by nothing so much as a respect for facts. But there are times when even the most enthusiastic collectors of facts must pause, and devote themselves to comprehensive theorising about the facts, and such a time we have reached in the study of the Old Testament. There are, of course, difficulties attendant upon every critical theory (whether Homer or the Bible be the subject), but let not Mr. Gladstone suppose that Old Testament scholars have waited for him to propound such difficulties to them. They are provided with answers, sometimes complete, sometimes incomplete, deserving a respectful attention, and not to be blown away by an adverse gale of untrained common-sense. They welcome objections made in the right spirit, because they believe that their study has a real bearing on the welfare of the Christian Church, and they desire the laity to show its perception of this. But they would venture to point out that a certain degree of knowledge and experience is necessary to make useful objections. Even a practised New Testament scholar is not necessarily a good judge of Old Testament problems, the conditions of which, as Professor Sanday has often remarked to me, are so different from those of the New. Need I add that a Homeric scholar may also have to pass through a short apprenticeship in order to make objections fruitfully?

Mr. Gladstone's two questions are:—

> Have we not then to wait for the evidence which is to show that the doctrine of immortality would have been too great a strain for the Hebrews at the reputed era of the composition of the Psalms under David and Solomon?

And—

> Even were such evidence to be forthcoming on behalf of the general proposition, we should still have to ask how it is known, or why it is to be believed, that the idea of immortality was made known to the Hebrews from Persian sources (p. 663).

The first of these questions was suggested by my own remark that the ascription of the Psalms to the Persian period (I put aside the question as to psalms of the early Greek and Maccabæan periods) conduces to 'the interests not merely of critical progress, but of religion,' because it involves a 'great strain upon faith' to suppose that the hope of immortality was known in the times of David and Solomon. Mr. Gladstone unconsciously gives a little twist to my language, transferring the supposed 'strain' to the Israelites (so again on p. 673), which has the effect of burdening me with a theory of revelation which I do not accept. The phenomena of revelation are indeed, I admit, no illusions. The 'man of God' is 'taken hold of' by Another, but not without his own will and the co-operation of his highest faculties. A genuine revelation must be proportionate to the mental and moral state of the person receiving it, or a psychological exegesis such as is now being founded among us becomes impossible. Mr. Gladstone will pardon me if I infer too much from his language (p. 671), and wrongly address to him the protest against an excessive supernaturalism which I find dramatically introduced in one of his own essays.* He certainly appears to me to have misread his 'text' under the influence of a too mechanical theory of revelation. I spoke designedly not of a 'doctrine' but of an 'intuition' of immortality, to indicate the human element which blends in revelation with the divine, and the 'strain upon faith' of which I spoke had reference to us and not to the Israelites. Does Mr. Gladstone want evidence that this 'strain upon faith' exists? Colonel Ingersoll, or any of our own secularists, would be only too ready to provide him with it. Or take the famous article on David in the Dictionary of Pierre Bayle, which excited such a warm controversy in the last century. In it I find these words :—

---

* Warburton, *Divine Legation*, Bk. VI. sect. 2 (*Works*, v. 357).

† Warburton, *Works*, iv. 74.

> 'David's piety is so conspicuous in his psalms and in several of his actions, that it cannot be sufficiently admired. There is one thing which is no less admirable in his conduct—to wit, that he could so happily (!) reconcile so much piety with the loose maxims of the art of reigning.†

Now it is certain that a thorough study of the early records of the life of David in the light of a critical analysis and in an historical spirit introduces us to the most attractive character of ancient Israel, and even permits us to regard David as in his degree a herald of spiritual religion. But it also forbids us to believe that any of the psalms, as they now stand, were written by David. Indeed, even without appealing to criticism, the perusal of 1 Sam. xvi.–1 Kings ii. 11 makes the traditional view difficult in the extreme. For a living faith in immortality presupposes a development of the moral nature such as we do not find in the David of the narratives. And if the 'strain upon faith' is not yet sufficiently proved, let us carry on our reading as far as the works of Isaiah the son of Amoz. Do we find any trace of the hope of immortality there? Yes; but only of the immortality *of the nation*. Are we then to suppose that Isaiah, having the larger hope in himself, suppressed it out of regard to his dull audience? or that his works are a full repertory of the highest hopes and aspirations of his time? Can there be a doubt as to the right answer? But what a 'strain upon faith' to suppose that the David of the Books of Samuel possessed that larger hope of which Isaiah himself was ignorant!

Nor can this argument be met by referring, with Mr. Gladstone (p. 673), to the Egyptian and Iranian peoples as having been familiar with 'the doctrine of immortality' before the time of David. Let us suppose for the moment that there is an early Egyptian doctrine of immortality which can be compared with that of the higher parts of the Bible: how does this make it easier to believe that such a 'doctrine' was current in the Davidic age? For the hieroglyphic texts prove, at any rate, that the moral and mental development of the early Egyptians was far in advance of that of David and his contemporaries. It would have been wiser in my critic to confine his reference to the Iranians, whose prophet Zarathustra is placed by Haug, West, Mills, and Geldner, on satisfactory grounds, in a period anterior to David. That Zarathustra was indeed a living, earnestly striving, and holy man, who had received a prophetic call from the true God known to him as the Omniscient Lord (*Ahura Mazda*), is clear from the Gâthâs. If Mr. Gladstone had but read and meditated on these ancient hymns (of which we have now an amply sufficient translation, with commentary, in the *Sacred Books of the East*), he would have been able, from his own point of view, to strengthen his argument considerably. For a belief in immortality, strongly akin to the Christian, so pervades the Gâthâs that it is quite impossible by analysis to discover any oldest portions from which it is absent. Mr. Gladstone might first have challenged me to prove that the Eastern Iranians whom Zarathustra taught were morally and mentally superior to the Israelites contemporary with David, and then asked me why the same 'precious knowledge' should not have been divinely 'imparted' to David which the Gâthâs prove to have been possessed by Zarathustra. My reply would, however, have been ready. I admit that what is asked can only be proved by exegetical evidence from the Gâthâs, which, from the nature of the case, cannot be as immediately convincing as the direct positive statements of the narratives in Samuel. I do not think, however, that any student of the Gâthâs will question what I now bring forward. The Eastern or North-Eastern Iranians, among whom Zarathustra laboured, were a law-abiding, industrious population, who not only contended earnestly for their faith against the Daêva*-worshippers, but proved its soundness by the fruits of good living. For it was a moral as well as a religious movement in which they had engaged, and the immortality which their prophet promised was a spiritual blessing, reserved for the faithful worshippers of Mazda. The very imperfections and crudeness of the Gâthâs prove that they are no mere forgeries, but were adapted to the moral and mental state of the people. There is no reason, therefore, to doubt that the followers of Zarathustra were both morally and mentally superior to the Israelites of the Davidic age; and Mr. Gladstone's appeal to the early date of Zarathustra's teaching must be rejected.

---

* Gladstone, *Gleanings of Past Years*, iii. 46.

† Bayle, *Historical Dictionary* (Lond. 1736), iv. 535.

Mr. Gladstone's second question I must beg leave to recast, because in its present form it misrepresents my theory.† I must, of course, be specially careful myself not to burden Mr. Gladstone with any assumption unpalatable to him. What he really wants to know is probably this: What ground is there for supposing that, even if the hope of immortality first became current among the Jews in the late Persian period, this was in any degree due to Zoroastrian influence? Even as thus recast, the inquiry appears to me somewhat strange. Mr. Gladstone willingly recognises a large Hellenic 'intellectual factor' in 'the new dispensation of Christianity' (p. 671); why should he hesitate to admit at least a moderate Persian influence on the religion of the Jewish Church? There were, no doubt, native Israelitish germs of the later hope of immortality; but why did not Jeremiah or the Second Isaiah bring them to light and develop their latent meaning? Evidently help was required from without; more advanced religious thinkers had to assist the slow but highly receptive Jewish mind. Still, I will endeavour to answer Mr. Gladstone, and I will do this, not by referring him to books and articles which he may not have time to read, but by a very brief summary of the facts and considerations which I have already brought forward elsewhere.

Let me take as my starting-point a very just and significant remark of Mr. Gladstone. 'The Captivity,' he says, 'was not a Persian but a Babylonian captivity.' It is true that the Jehovah (Yahvè) of the Second Isaiah has a specially close resemblance to the Ahura Mazda of Zoroastrianism, but this is no proof of any historical connection between the two conceptions of God. If the deepened insight into the nature of God which meets us in the Second Isaiah was in any degree helped by foreign stimulus, that stimulus must have come from Babylon. The fact that the Babylonians and the Israelites who sojourned in their midst acquired similar ideas of the divine nature about the same time suggests that there may have been some religious intercourse between them.* Advanced Old Testament criticism has made it highly probable that some of the early narratives in Genesis, written shortly before and during the Exile, are partly of Babylonian origin; it is not unreasonable to hold that the higher Jewish conception of Jehovah was at any rate promoted to some extent by the higher Babylonian conception of Marduk. Towards the end of the Exile, I know, any friendly feeling which the Jews may have had for Babylon gave place to hatred; it is not for the religion of Babylon, but for that of Persia (represented by Cyrus), that the Second Isaiah expresses a general sympathy. But in earlier years, when Jeremiah's advice (Jer. xxix. 7) was fully carried out, it was probably different. Nor was it only the nature of God, but the future lot of the soul, on which the Jewish exiles seem to have formed ideas akin to that of their masters. I admit that Babylonian ideas on a future state may have reached the Israelites through the Canaanites long before;† indeed, we may partly thus account for the splendid close of the story of Elijah (2 Kings ii. 11), which is, of course, a pre-Exilic work. But it is more than probable that the belief in the possibility of escaping death (or of escaping out of death, for the two ideas were not sharply distinguished) was strengthened by a revived acquaintance with Babylonian myths, like that of Sit-napistim or 'Xisuthrus' during the Exile. Now, granting this, it becomes all the easier to admit that in due time a still greater influence was exercised upon the Jews by the Persians.

---

* 'Il s'agit de l'indo-iranien *daiva* "dieu," sanscrit *deva*, devenu en zend *daêva* "démon."' Darmesteter, *Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 265.

† See above, p. 953.

* *Bampton Lectures*, 1889, p. 269.

† The letters sent by kings and governors of Western Asia to the Pharaohs Amenôphis the Third and Amenôphis the Fourth (see *Records of the Past*, iv. 57, &c.) prove that before the Egyptian conquests, and before the rise of the Assyrian kingdom, Babylonian culture had spread to the shores of the Mediterranean. Religious myths must have formed a part of this culture.

Mr. Gladstone deals with the theory of Persian influence in three sentences (pp. 663–4). He draws a distinction between Magianism and Zoroastrianism, and quotes Haug as denying the adoption by the Jews of Persian words on the subject of religion. But as to the first point, viz. that Persian influence in the Achæmenian period would promote Magianism rather than Zoroastrianism, Mr. Gladstone has, I fear, misunderstood his authorities. I am well aware of the difficulties connected with the history of early Mazda-worship, but few contemporary critics would care to deny that the ideas and sacred texts of Achæmenian Mazda-worship are in the main reproduced in the Avesta.[*] Even M. de Harlez, whose theological tendencies are somewhat similar to Mr. Gladstone's, sums up thus: 'The result is that the Gâthâs are the exclusive work of the Magi, and that the Avesta owes to them the greater part of its contents and its ultimate form.'[†] Now as to the second point. It would, no doubt, add strength to our argument if we had other linguistic proofs of the religious influence of the Persians upon the Jews besides the derivation of Asmodeus (see Tobit) from Aeshma-dêva. But the value of linguistic proofs may easily be exaggerated, for even when words are borrowed, the significations do not always remain the same. The attributes of the demon Asmodeus are in fact not altogether those of the Zend Aeshma-dêva. But I need not linger on this point; the reality of Zoroastrian influence upon Judaism is now generally recognised. The post-Exilic angelology and demonology of the Jews assumed more and more a Persian colouring; the belief in Satan, for instance, may be thoroughly Hebraic, and yet it would hardly have grown up as it did without the indirect influence of the belief in Ahriman against which it was a protest. So too the ancient blessing called *yōçēr ōr* had no doubt a polemical reference to Zoroastrianism, and yet the custom of reciting it at dawn was no doubt influenced by a similar Zoroastrian ordinance.[‡] And though the establishment of the Law as the basis of Jewish national life was of course justified by the parallel of Deuteronomy (2 Kings xxii., xxiii.), yet we can hardly doubt that Ezra the scribe was partly influenced by the existence of the great 'book-religion' of Persia. And can we stop short here? There is indeed no necessity to suppose that the conception of God was affected (except very indirectly through the Satan-belief) by the Zoroastrian faith, but that of a future state surely may have been. Take the idea of the resurrection for instance. If Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii. was written, as Professor Driver supposed in 1888, on the eve of the Captivity, we might suppose that it was a gifted prophet's inference from the firmly believed promise of the national restoration. But if, as this excellent scholar now admits, it is a post-Exilic work, it becomes at once possible that Persian influence assisted its development. Or take the idea of the immortality of the soul. If the six psalms mentioned at the beginning of this article are pre-Exilic, we must either deny that there is any reference in them to immortality, or, if we venture to admit such a reference, we must explain it on the same principle as in the former case. At any rate, as Professor Kuenen remarks, speaking of my own recent theories, we must, in accounting for the higher Jewish developments, consider the possibility not only of Hellenic but of Persian influences.[*]

The subject is indeed one of much greater importance than Mr. Gladstone's remarks would suggest. We are just at the beginning of a momentous historical discussion as to the character and origin of essential Christianity, and we cannot get very much further than Dr. Hatch has carried us without an investigation of the character and origin of pre-Christian Judaism. It has often been said that even the New Testament writings contain an Hellenic element, and Professor Pfleiderer has expressed the opinion that 'Hellenic eschatology had influenced the general belief of the Jews in the time of Jesus through the channel of Essenism.' These ideas are in the air; and though Dr. Hatch has not expressly said so, we cannot doubt that he would have admitted an unconscious Hellenism in parts of the New Testament. I think myself that this theory, under due limitations, is in a high degree probable, and I would ask if an infiltration of Hellenism into *Palestinian* Judaism does not become much more intelligible if more or less similar Oriental influences had gone before. I would even go further and inquire whether the Jewish Hellenistic philosophy of Alexandria is not more easily accounted for, if the Jews who, willingly or by compulsion, entered Egypt under the early Ptolemies had been already in some slight degree Zoroastrianised.

---

[*] Cf. Darmesteter, *Zendavesta* ('Sacred Books of the East'), Part I. Introd. p. liii.

[†] De Harlez *Avesta*, Introd. p. cxcii.

[‡] *Bampton Lectures*, 1889, pp. 272, 448.

[*] *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, September 1891, p. 593.

For the elaboration of this theory of a partial Zoroastrianising of post-Exilic Judaism I must refer to the writings already referred to. In considering it, the reader will kindly remember the limitations under which I hold it. 1. It is not till the latter part of the Persian rule that I suppose Zoroastrian influences to have been strongly felt, or at any rate to have affected the higher religious literature. The leaders of the Church-nation and those who wrote for its edification were naturally slow in sanctioning non-Jewish influence. 2. I do not suppose the Jews to have read the Zoroastrian writings, though I refer to those writings, and especially the Gâthâs, as a repertory of Zoroastrian ideas. It must be remembered that the ideas of book-religions are not propagated even now exclusively by their sacred writings. 3. Zoroastrian influence was generally limited by Jewish presuppositions. The only exceptions to be made have relation to popular superstitions. 4. 'Indirectly Persia must have influenced the Jews throughout her vast empire, but directly not so much the Jews in Palestine as the large Israelitish colonies on the east of the Euphrates and the Tigris, which, however, must have transmitted the results to the Jews in Palestine.'* 5. I assume that Isa. xxiv.–xxvii. (chapters which contain references to the annihilation of death and the resurrection of dead Israelites) were written not very early in the Persian period, that the Book of Daniel was composed at the beginning of the Maccabæan rising (B.C. 164), and that the psalms (or all the psalms but the eighteenth) were written during the Persian and early Greek periods. These dates I believe to be a close approximation to the true ones. Even with regard to the psalms, critics will soon probably be agreed that in their present forms few, if any, are earlier than the Exile. It may no doubt be possible for some critics to hold a Davidic element (which they will seldom, however, be able to indicate), or at any rate an element derived from the age of Jeremiah. But the most plausible view, because the most consistent with the other results which are forcing themselves upon impartial critics, is, I venture to think, that which I have adopted. 6. I am far from supposing that a primary reference in the psalms to immortality or the resurrection can be made out with certainty. But, as a Jewish critic observes, 'if there be psalms of the Maccabæan age, they would certainly agree, as to the immortality of the soul, with the Pharisees;'* and the same remark may be extended, as I believe, to some at least of the psalms of the Persian age. Only, as the hope of immortality was not universally accepted, it is natural to expect that even those psalmists who themselves held it would express themselves in such a way as to edify even those who had less mature thoughts. 'Not merely because they were Eastern poets, but in obedience probably to the law of charity, they used vague expressions which needed to be explained mentally from the stock of ideas which the worshippers brought with them. To those whose religious position was the comparatively dry and meagre one of the older orthodoxy of Israel, those expressions had a dry and meagre sense; but to those who were being led to the confines of a nobler faith the same words acquired a depth of significance which the older interpreters only erred in making too logically definite.'

But I have already tried my respected critic's patience too long. I will conclude with an expression of sympathy with him in his great object of improving the historical defence of Christianity, and not less with the two translators of the *Avesta* in the *Sacred Books of the East* in their efforts to promote a better appreciation of the religion of the 'Omniscient Lord.' I dare not say that the two religions, or even that Judaism and Zoroastrianism are on an equality, but I may be thankful that when the appointed time for the blending of the Aryan and the Semitic mind had come, the ideas of Zarathustra had not become too much overlaid to be helpful in the process. And I cannot but recognise that had there been in Iran a succession of spiritual prophets like Zarathustra, the chief factor in the religion of the future might have been not Semitic, but Aryan.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

BY CARDINAL MANNING, PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, D.D., AND REV. JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D.

From *The Review of the Churches* (London), November, 1891.

His Eminence Cardinal Manning.

My dear Dr. Lunn,—I will not again refuse to send you a few words, but it is difficult for me to do more than listen to the voices which are reviewing "the Churches."

---

* *Bampton Lectures*, 1889, p. 281.

* Isidore Loeb, *Revue des études juives*, avril–juin 1890, p. 165.

In May, 1848, I saw and spoke for the first time with Pius IX. He questioned me at length about the Christianity of England, and about the multiplicity of good and charitable works done by Anglicans and Dissenters, ending with the Quakers and the great prison reformation of Mrs. Fry. He then leaned back in his chair, and said, as if to himself, "The English do a multitude of good works; and when men do good works God always pours out His grace. My poor prayers are offered day by day for England." Since that time every year has multiplied all kinds of good works in England. There can be no doubt that an especial power of the Holy Ghost has breathed and is still breathing over our people. I gladly repeat the words of Pius IX., for I rejoice over the good works which cover the face of our country. My daily prayer is for England, and so far as it has been in my power I have shared your good works and united with your peaceful and beneficent aims. In the words which open your first number I heartily agree. You say, "The tendency of religion in our day is towards union." There has grown up in the last fifty years a vivid sense or instinct that division is evil, and the source of evils. The desire and prayers for the reunion of Christendom have created movements and organizations both in the Anglican and in the Dissenting bodies, and your *Review of the Churches* is its latest and most resolute manifestation.

When I held back from writing as one of your contributors it was not from any slackness in desiring that all our hearts may be drawn into unity, but from unwillingness to strike a note out of harmony with you. You have many ways of seeking union. We have but one. Union in good works has indeed a constraining moral influence in bringing the most remote men together, and charity is a way to Truth: "If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." This is a safe course for those who are divided from each other. Controversy repels, but charity unites. Your present action cannot fail to bring many minds into closer union of good-will.

But this is neither our need nor our method. Union is not unity. And unity is not the creation of human wills, but of the Divine. It does not spring up from the earth: it descends from heaven. St. Cyprian truly describes it as the raiment of our Lord, "without seam, woven *from the top* throughout by heavenly sacraments." It is Truth that generates Unity, and it can be recovered only by the same principle and from the same source from which it descended in the beginning.

Mr. Price Hughes has quoted, he says with surprise, some words of mine from a book on the "Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost." There was no need for surprise; for these words are only the Catholic doctrine of the universality of Grace. And they presuppose the doctrine of the visible Church, which has not only a visible body, but also an invisible soul. The soul of the Church is as old as Abel, and as wide as the race of mankind. It embraces every soul of man who has lived, or at least has died, in union with God by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. Nearly thirty years ago I published all this in answer to my friend, the late Dr. Pusey, in a letter on "The Workings of the Spirit in the Church of England." This letter has been lately reprinted by Messrs. Burns and Oates. Thus far then I can lay a basis on which to write and to hope with all your contributors. We believe that the Holy Ghost breathes throughout the world, and gathers into union with God, and to eternal life, all those who faithfully co-operate with His light and grace. None are responsible for dying *inculpably* out of the visible Body of the Church. They only are culpable who knowingly and wilfully reject its divine voice when sufficiently known to them. But I must not go on, for you are seeking union in agreements, and I have no will to strike a discordant note. You say truly "the controversies to which most of our Churches owe their rise have lost much of their interest for us; some of them are hardly intelligible."

I have two great advantages. I can hope and embrace you in the Soul of the Church, and I can rejoice in all, and gladly share in many of your good works.

May the Holy Ghost renew His own unity in Truth!

Believe me, my dear Dr. Lunn,
Yours very truly,
HENRY E. CARD. MANNING.

Archbishop's House, October 30th, 1891.

REV. PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

The Reunion of the Churches, what a boon! "I tell you of a truth," said Jesus to His disciples, "there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." What would one not give to be able to say with equal confidence, "There be some now living who shall not taste of death till they see the divisions of the Church healed." Such a sight would mean the kingdom of God come. How happy one would be to witness even a small instalment of the grand consummation: say the reunion of the Scottish Presbyterian Church! What a burden to the spirit of a man who has learned thoroughly the mind of Christ to live in days of religious alienations and embitterments! How often one is tempted to wish that his lot had been cast in a time when there was only one church in the land, and all the people, high and low, rich and poor, met together for divine worship in the one parish church, and the distinction between Churchmen and Dissenters was unknown. Richard Baxter said, "Except the case of the infidel world, nothing is so sad to my thoughts as the case of the divided churches." We who live in the nineteenth century may utter the same sentiment with an emphasis increased by the knowledge that the two cases alluded to by Baxter are very closely allied: that the divisions of the Church are a fruitful cause of infidelity.

Personally I am a Broad Churchman in my ecclesiastical views, though by accident connected with a Nonconformist denomination holding very strict principles as to the conditions of church fellowship. I could without any trouble to my conscience belong to, and even be a minister in, any one of a dozen or a score of churches, if they would allow me, and give me liberty to speak and act according to my convictions. I think all the forms of church government legitimate and good when they are well worked out, and the reverse of good when they are mismanaged, as they all have been. I do not believe in elaborate creeds as terms of communion. I should gladly be in the same church with men belonging to an entirely different theological school from myself; if half a dozen different schools were represented within the same communion, so much the richer it would be.

Whence these tragic, disastrous alienations? Why is Christendom to so lamentable an extent a house divided against itself to its own fatal hurt, and the dishonour of the Christian name? Why is the Church, to speak plainly, a ghastly failure? A full answer to these questions would demand a volume, but a rudimentary yet far-reaching answer may be given in a sentence. The radical cause of separation is *legalism*. It is very significant that Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, on first mentioning the sonship of Christians, proceeds immediately after to speak of the new society based on the Christian faith as one in which is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, but all are one in Christ. It is easy to find the missing link between the two topics. In Paul's view the first and fundamental privilege of sonship is deliverance from the bondage of the law. But the law was the great barrier between Jews and Gentiles; that removed, there was nothing to prevent them being united in a Christian brotherhood on equal terms. This was the first historical instance of the connection between the spirit of sonship and the spirit of catholicity. But it is not the only possible application of the principle. The tendency of the legal spirit is to multiply causes of separation, both in religious faith and in religious practice; in the former by increasing needlessly the number of "fundamentals," in the latter by erecting every petty scruple about meats and drinks, and social customs, and forms of worship to the dignity of a principle separating from all who do not conform thereto. The legal spirit is essentially anti-catholic, and manifests itself as such in a thousand different ways. On the other hand, the spirit of sonship is eminently catholic; craves for fellowship with all who are sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ; and would, if it could, sweep away all the artificial barriers which legalism has set up between those who are one in Christ. What a change would come over the face of Christendom if the *spirit of Adoption* were poured out in abundant measure on all who bear the Christian name!

Blame must be distributed impartially among all sections of the Christian Church. Legalism has assumed two chief forms: sacramentalism and dogmatism. Sacramental legalism, with all that goes along with it, is the vice of the Roman Catholic Church and all other churches kindred to it in spirit and tendency. Dogmatic legalism is the besetting sin of Protestantism. Salvation by sacraments and priests is the watchword of the one, salvation by orthodoxy is the watchword of the other. *Hinc illae lacrymae.* Both alike sin against the spirit of Christ and the true genius of Christianity. Sacramentalism and dogmatism are Antichrists, and till they are both destroyed there is no hope of reunion.

Optimistic in temper and tendency, I am not, never have been, hopeful of reunion on the great scale, or even on the small. The unification of Christendom is too high for me, my most sanguine moods cannot attain unto such a lofty thought. I should die happy if I lived to see so modest a consummation as the reconstruction of the Scottish Presbyterian Church. There is no present prospect of it, there is not much of the temper that makes union possible, or of the spirit that makes union worth having. For the merely mechanical combination of two or more ecclesiastical bodies is not a consummation devoutly to be wished; it is more a political than a religious result. Possibly even such a union, if it could be brought about, would be better than the present miserable condition of things with its rival churches in every village, and petty jealousies and enmities all over the land. The two dry sticks representing Israel and Judah, on being placed end to end, were to become one in Ezekiel's hand. The prophetic parable is in favour of the policy of uniting even dry lifeless ecclesiastical bodies, in hope that after mechanical juxtaposition would come sooner or later a real vital spiritual union and communion. But that is no reason why churchmen should postpone the practice of Christian charity towards each other till it has become their *interest* to love or seem to love one another as brethren, which is pretty much what we are doing just now, north of the Tweed.

The prospects of union on the great scale or on the small depend largely on what we principally wish. The wish, the fervent desire, the devout, sincere longing and prayer is, in the spiritual sphere, literally the father of the fact. Seek the kingdom of God with all your heart, and you have it in yourself. Seek it collectively with one mind and heart, and it will come eventually as a great social fact. What do we Christians want then? What do we dream of, talk about to friends, muse over in our solitary hours? Is it this grand ideal, the kingdom of Heaven: men the world over living in harmony and peace with God and with one another? Which are we putting first: Christ and the great universal Christian interest, or our own particular ecclesiastical denominations, our dearly cherished creeds, our provincial orthodoxies, and pet theological systems?

I have my fears for the future. I tremble lest the doom be pronounced on the churches, "Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone." Among the possibilities of the future are the ejection of the existing churches as salt that has lost its savour, leaving a clear field for the spirit of Christ, reincarnating itself in a wholly new organisation of whose constitution we know as little as of the life beyond the tomb. No religious society likes to be told such plain truths. The tendency is to silence the prophet who dares to utter them. But nevertheless plain speaking is wholesome. We must remember the fate of the Jewish Church. For centuries it seemed as if the true religion could not dispense with Israel as its chosen home. Even Isaiah preached the inviolability of Zion in language as strong as that of Christ when He declared that the gates of Hades should not prevail against the Church about to be founded. Yet a century after another prophet came, whose not less inspired message to Israel was: trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord. The temple in which ye trust shall be destroyed by the Chaldeans.

An increasing amount of the moral salt of the community is taking its place outside of all the churches. The attitude of those without towards Christianity is various. Some look on it as a worn-out faith; others, and probably not a few, are Christian in faith and life, only they do not feel that the Church can do much for them; perhaps they very decidedly think that church fellowship would be rather a hindrance than a help to the life they desire to lead. These constitute a kind of invisible church on earth. In our schemes of reconstruction we must aim at including this church of the churchless. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring." It will be well to find out what they are thinking, why it is they hold aloof, what it is in our church life that makes them regard our fellowship with indifference, not to say aversion. Would it not be advisable to have them represented by deputation at our church congresses to give us a bit of their mind? Perhaps this is unnecessary. We know already what keeps many aloof. It is just what makes the Church of little real value to our own souls. All meditations on reunion must end in prayer, in confession of sin, and supplication for mercy and grace. Ah me! how little of Christ and how much of Rabbinism is in all the churches. "Wilt Thou not revive us again, that Thy people may rejoice in Thee? Show us Thy mercy, O Lord, and grant us Thy salvation."

A. B. BRUCE.

REV. JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D.

Dr. Martineau wrote the following as a private opinion on the discussion on Reunion, but has given us permission to publish it. Those who desire fuller information as to Dr. Martineau's views on this question will find them in the second volume of the *Essays, Reviews, and Addresses* recently published :

If I thought that the Union so greatly needed could be brought nearer by discussion among the parties now severed, I would gladly join in the debate. I send you my few words on a subject very dear to my heart. But so long as Christian communion founds itself upon specified concurrence of doctrinal opinion, so that each Church has its "orthodoxy" which it binds itself to guard, I feel persuaded that the more you convene and "interview" these varieties, though with a view to minimize their differences, the more will you deepen the sense of division. Union, as a power in life, depends on Love, Reverence, and Duty taking a direction in common, and not on intellectual judgments shaping themselves into the same proposition. The value of a defined belief—its freshness and efficacy—are contingent on its being personally earned by the individual, and in harmony with the needs of his character. But the power of a religion lies in the enthusiasm of a common adoration, trust and self-devotion to the Infinitely Holy Will. A Christian Church fulfils its part when dedicated to the worship of the Heavenly Father and the furtherance of the Christian life ; and it is not entitled to include among its terms of communion any belief beyond what is implied for each member in these acts of piety and aspirations of conscience and love.

Till the Churches have shifted their base entirely off their *Creed Fundamentals,* and planted themselves simply on the Christian ideal of spiritual character and holy life, I see no hope of the real inward union for which alone I deeply care. External fusions may take place, from the dying away of this or that separating usage or doctrine, so as to simplify the statistics of sects and economise the cost of administration. But I do not see that the absorption of half a dozen minor firms in a single joint-stock company of insurance has any tendency to abate the ills of a monopoly of salvation.

The sympathetic spiritual fellowship which alone interests me will take place spontaneously and silently through natural affinities, stealing unconsciously through literature and personal life, far more effectively and rapidly than by any organised will-work of ours. The moment you call attention to it and try to hasten it you frighten as many people as you enlist, and send to opposite poles the forces that else were homogeneous as front and rear on the same line of advance.

It follows from what I have said that the present omission of the Unitarians from the "Union of Churches" does not affect me as any grievance. I know of no United Church in England ; and if there were one I could no more belong to it than to a Trinitarian Church ; the doctrinal basis being alike objectionable in both, and indeed less excusable in the Unitarian, where the doctrine named is not deemed essential to salvation. If there be those, as apparently there are, who would fain organise themselves into a Unitarian Church, I cannot speak for them, for I do not share their aspirations, but must remain one of the many private Unitarians who are scattered among various Christian communions, or unrecognised by any. JAMES MARTINEAU.

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY A. H. SAYCE, LL.D.

From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh), December, 1891.

BIBLICAL history has been unfairly treated. It has been placed under the microscope, and every minute detail brought into undue relief. On the one hand, there has been a bias, conscious or unconscious, to prove that it is false and unveracious ; on the other hand, there has been a determination to explain away all difficulties and reconcile even the irreconcilable. Evidence which would be considered quite sufficient in the case of secular history, has been condemned when the narratives of the Old Testament are in question, while, conversely, the defenders of the scriptural text have too frequently forgotten the elementary principles of common sense. There is no historical book in the world, much less books which have come down to us from antiquity, which could stand the test of that microscopic examination which requires every word and sentence to possess the definiteness and accuracy of a problem of Euclid ; there is equally no work of fiction the veracious character of which could not be demonstrated by the methods often employed by apologetic theologians.

If we are going to study the Bible from a historical point of view, we ought to treat it as we should any other collection of ancient books which profess to contain history. The evidence required by the historian is not the same in degree, or even in kind, as that required by the physicist or mathematician. The evidence is circumstantial and inductive, and the conclusions to which it points are probable only. But in historical inquiry, as in the ordinary affairs of life, a certain amount of probability is equivalent to certainty. This fact has been repeatedly forgotten by critics of the Old Testament Scriptures. Passages have been declared to be contradictory, which are so only if a particular interpretation of one or more of them be adopted ; a few inaccuracies in unimportant matters of detail have been declared to invalidate the whole of the narrative in which they are found ; and a degree of mathematical precision has been demanded from the Biblical writers, which would not, and could not, be required from the writers of secular history.

But this is not all. The critic has started with certain fixed ideas and prepossessions, which have made him deny the historical character or early age of all statements and documents which run counter to them. It has been an axiom that writing for literary purposes was of late invention, and among the Canaanites or Israelites, at all events, could not have gone back to the age of Moses. Consequently, none of the books of the Old Testament, it has been assumed, can be earlier than the Davidic period, and the events they profess to record must be myths and legends, or else traditions coloured by the beliefs and conceptions of a later day. So again, intercourse between different parts of Western Asia in the time of Abraham has been determined to be an impossibility, and the account, therefore, of conquests in Palestine by kings of Elam and Babylonia has been pronounced to be a fable. The "higher" critic was better instructed on all these points than the ancient Israelitish writer.

The conclusions of the "higher criticism," as regards the history of the Old Testament, were necessarily imperfect and one-sided. It had nothing with which to compare the earlier narratives of the Bible, no form of contemporaneous evidence which bore upon them, and by means of which their truth could be tested. During the greater part of the period covered by the Biblical records they stood alone, and it was only by the help of internal evidence that their claims to veracity could be examined. The "higher" critic was thus dealing with what the logicians would call a "single instance," and every logician knows that from a single instance no conclusion of scientific value can be drawn. It was only in so far as the "higher criticism" occupied itself with the inner structure and date of the books it dealt with, and with the relation of one portion of the scriptural narrative to another, that it was able to attain to solid results. It could show, for instance, that the Levites occupy a different position in the Book of Deuteronomy from that which is assigned to them in other parts of the Pentateuch, and that the chronological data relating to the lives of the patriarchs are inconsistent and incredible ; to go further and maintain that the story of the Mosaic legislation was a fiction, and that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were figures of mythology, was to pass beyond the evidence and the limits within which it compelled the critic to move.

The "higher" critic, moreover, like the "apologist," could not help being a theologian. His subject-matter was too straitly confined to a literature, the main interest of which, in the eyes of the majority of Jews and Christians, was religious. Theological controversies had raged, and were still raging, around it, and the critic felt himself bound to take a side. Doubtless he professed to be impartial, but a scholar whose studies are confined to a particular branch of literature cannot help identifying himself with that literature, and thereby with all that it implies. It was with good reason that, in our older Universities, the Chair of Hebrew was associated with theology ; the Hebraist can hardly help being a theologian, unless his study of Hebrew is merely the consequence of his earlier study of some other Oriental language. The great Hebraists, like Ewald and Olshausen, were theologians, rather than comparative Semitic philologists.

If, however, our researches into Biblical history are to be free from the charges of bias and unfairness, if they are to end in results of permanent value, which will be acknowledged by all trained historians, they must be pursued in the same spirit and upon the same lines as researches into secular history. We must put aside all theological prepossessions whatever, and examine the narratives of the Old Testament as we should examine the narratives in other ancient books. We must, in short, be archæologists and not theologians.

Thirty years ago such an examination would have been impossible. We were but beginning to recover the past history of the Oriental world from the grave in which it had so long slept. The excavator, indeed, had already been busy, but the meaning and importance of his work were still but inadequately understood, and the monuments which he had found were only beginning to be made to tell their tale. The excavations of Botta and Layard had still to bear their choicest fruit, and the discoveries of Champollion and Lepsius, of Rawlinson and Oppert, were but laying the foundations for future research.

A new era was inaugurated by Dr. Schliemann. He revolutionised the study of early Greek history, and, therewith, of the early history of other nations as well. He showed that when the "higher" criticism had done its worst, when it had thrown doubt on the antiquity of our literary records, and on the history contained in them, the excavator and his interpreter could step in and reconstruct the fallen edifice. The evidence of material objects—of architectural remains, of pottery and metal work—is more convincing than the most ingenious arguments of the "higher" critic, and the most plausible theories of the scholar.

It has been proved that the story of Akhæan culture and power in the Peloponnesus was no myth, but a sober reality; that the intercourse by sea with foreign lands, which Greek tradition remembered, actually took place, and that the influence of Egypt was strongly felt by the princes of Mykênæ. For a time, indeed, there were some who could not forego their older prejudices and accept the new and startling facts brought to light by the great explorer; and it has been reserved for another great excavator of our century, Mr. Flinders Petrie, to complete Dr. Schliemann's work, and prove from the dated remains of Egypt, that the civilisation revealed by the spade at Mykênæ and Tiryns is really of the age to which Greek tradition referred it. The substantial accuracy of the picture of "prehistoric" Greek culture, sketched for us in Homer and in the earlier pages of Greek historians, has been triumphantly vindicated. Inaccuracies of detail have been shown to be consistent with the trustworthiness of the general fact.

By the archæologist and historian Biblical history and Greek history must be treated in the same way. They must be studied in accordance with the same method, and the canons of evidence which hold good for the one must hold good also for the other. Necessarily, therefore, the study of Biblical history has closely followed the example set it by the study of Greek history. The negative results obtained in the field of Biblical history by the "higher" criticism are but an exaggerated form of the negative results already obtained, or supposed to be obtained, in the field of Greek history. The extreme scepticism of Havet, in regard to the history of the Old Testament, is but a reflection of the scepticism of Sir George Cox in regard to the history of the Greeks, and Havet, it is instructive to remember, was primarily a classical scholar. It is true that the scepticism exhibited in the case of the Old Testament records exceeds that which has been exhibited in the case of the Greek traditions. Greek writers have been allowed the benefit of a doubt which has been denied to the writers of Scripture. But this has been due to the importation of the spirit of the theologian into the examination of the Biblical books, and an unconscious bias against the popular belief in regard to them.

The reaction against the sceptical school in Greek history produced by the discoveries of Schliemann and other archæologists, is now beginning to be felt in Biblical studies as well. Naturally, however, it is felt by the archæologist and the student of those Oriental civilisations with which the Hebrews were in contact, rather than by the Hebraist pure and simple. It is not to be expected that the adherents of the "higher" criticism will at once surrender the beliefs and assumptions, the ideas and conclusions which they have cherished, or will admit, without a protest, the counter claims of Oriental archæology. The Assyriologist may show, for example, that in the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, the Canaanitish Asherah is proved to be a goddess by the determinative of divinity which is prefixed to her name; the "higher" critic will still adhere to a contrary assumption, evolved, though it has been, by what the Germans would call a "subjective" process, and supported only by the disputable evidence extracted from the pages of Scripture. That he should do so, however, matters little; the archæologist has no theological position to defend, and he can afford to wait until the evidence derived from facts, which can be seen and handled, has forced its way even into the strongholds of an over-refined philology.

It is not possible here to go in detail through the numerous cases in which the archæological discoveries of the last few years have re-established the credit of the writers of the Old Testament, and dissipated the ingenious objections that have been raised against them. Assyriology, Egyptology, prehistoric archæology, even explorations in Southern Arabia and Asia Minor, have alike been contributing to this result. All that I can do in these pages is to select a typical example of the demolition by the "higher" criticism of the historical character of a chapter in the Book of Genesis, and its successful vindication by recent Oriental research.

From several points of view the fourteenth chapter of Genesis is one of the most remarkable with which the historian is called upon to deal. Palestine and Babylonia are brought in it into direct relation with one another at a period when the geographical knowledge of the Babylonians has been supposed to have been confined within their own borders, and distant expeditions are stated to have been made by Babylonian princes such as we have been accustomed to consider were characteristic of a far later time. Moreover, the veil is lifted for a moment from the earlier history of Canaan; Jerusalem is shown to have been in existence centuries before the Israelites entered the Promised Land, and the mysterious figure of the priest-king Melchizedek appears upon the scene.

The "higher" criticism has long since relegated Melchizedek, along with Abram who paid tithes to him, to the realm of myth. For a time it adopted a more hesitating tone towards the story of the Babylonian campaign. But an article by Professor Nöldeke reassured the waverers; the names of the Canaanite kings were resolved into philological puzzles, and the whole account was demonstrated to be unhistorical. No armed expeditions it was alleged made their way from the banks of the Euphrates or Tigris to Palestine until the days of Assyrian conquest, and the last traces of history that had been allowed to remain in the Book of Genesis were ruthlessly swept away.

But the clay records still existed which were destined to confute the conclusions of German scholarship, and it was not long before the spade of the excavator made them known once more to the world. It was from Babylonia that the light first came. A copy of the annals of Sargon of Accad and his son Naram-Sin was brought to the British Museum, from which we learned that as far back as 3800 B.C., centuries before the age of Abraham, the Babylonian kings were making expeditions to the distant West. Four times did Sargon carry his arms to the shores of the Mediterranean, and on the fourth occasion he erected an image of himself by the side of the sea. A cylinder bearing the name of Naram-Sin has since been found in Cyprus, and the annals of that monarch further inform us that he made war against the King of Midian, a country from which the diorite had already been brought for the ancient Chaldæan statues that are now in the Louvre.

It is even possible that the name of one of the Babylonian princes mentioned in Genesis is met with in contemporaneous inscriptions. Bricks exist inscribed with the name of Eri-Aku, King of Larsa, whereon he calls himself the son of the Elamite Kudur-Mabug, "the father of Palestine." In Eri-Aku of Larsa it is difficult not to see Arioch of Ellasar, more especially as the inscriptions of Eri-Aku indicate the same Elamite suzerainty over Babylonia as that presupposed in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, while the name of Kudur-Mabug, "the servant of the god Mabug," is of the same character as that of Chedor-laomer—Kudur-Lagamar in cuneiform—"the servant of the god Lagamar."

That "the western land," of which Kudur-Mabug is termed "the father," was really Palestine, as it is in all other Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions known to us, is shown by a text recently discovered by Mr. Pinches. This gives the names and titles of a king who belonged to "the first Dynasty of Babylonia," and reigned about 2250 B.C. In it reference is made to "the Amorite land" of the West of which he is entitled "the king."

But it is the cuneiform tablets found at Tel-el-Amarna in Egypt which most conclusively prove not only that Palestine was overrun by the armies of Babylonia long before the days of the Israelitish invasion, but also that Babylonian influence must have been deep and lasting there. The tablets consist in large measure of the letters and despatches sent to the Egyptian monarchs in the century before the exodus by the governors and vassal-chieftains of Canaan. The language of the tablets is Babylonian, and the characters with which they are inscribed are those of the complicated syllabary of Babylonia. If anything else could better prove the profound impression that must have been made by Babylonian culture upon the populations of the West, it would be the Babylonian names of deities and of individuals which occur in some of the letters. Even the god of Jerusalem is assimilated to a Babylonian divinity by its Canaanitish prince. And when we consider the number of places in Palestine which continued to bear the names of such Babylonian deities as Rimmon, and Anah, and Anath, we cannot fail to be struck with the permanent effects of Babylonian intercourse with Canaan. The references to Babylonian conquest in the letters of the priest-king of Jerusalem show of what kind the intercourse was.

The campaign of Chedor-laomer and his allies, therefore, was no "proleptic" reflection of the military expeditions of the later Assyrian kings. The political condition of Babylonia, moreover, described in the account of it is a condition which, as we now know, answered strictly to the facts. In the north a prince reigned at Larsa, the Ellasar of Genesis, whose name was Eri-Aku, and who acknowledged as his suzerain the Elamite Kudur-Mabug. In the south, in Shinar or Sumer, there was another kingdom whose ruler had also to admit the supremacy of Elam. And the Elamite not only claimed supremacy in Babylonia; he was also "father of Palestine."

The second half of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, that which recounts the meeting between Abram and Melchizedek, has also received a remarkable confirmation from the clay records of the past. It is from the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna that the light in this instance has been derived. Ebed-Tob, the priest-king of Jerusalem, whose letters I have already referred to, represents himself as appointed to his office by "the oracle" of a god. He did not inherit his royal dignity from his father or his mother, or even from his lord and master, the King of Egypt, whose "friend" and ally he was. The name of the god is given as Salim or Salem, the god of "Peace," and is identified with one of the forms of the Sun-god worshipped in Babylonia. Like Melchizedek, therefore, Ebed-Tob was king in virtue of his priesthood, and might consequently be described as priest-king of Salem rather than as king of Uru-Salim, "the city of Salem." Moreover, the god whose temple stood on Mount Moriah was the god of "Peace," to whom accordingly it was fitting that those who had restored peace to Canaan by driving the enemy from its soil should pay their offerings. It is needless to point out what a commentary this is on the narrative which tells us how Abram, after the defeat of the Babylonian invader, paid tithes to Melchizedek, "the priest of the Most High God."

The confirmation thus unexpectedly afforded of the historical trustworthiness of the two narratives in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis opens up a still larger question. It shows that underneath the narratives of Genesis lie historical documents which come down from the age of the events which they record, and possess accordingly all the value of contemporaneous evidence. Whatever may have been the period when the book was compiled, its author or authors made use of written materials, and these written materials were as historically trustworthy as those on which we base our knowledge of the Persian wars with Greece. The history of Canaan before the Israelitish conquest was not a blank to be filled up by the legends and systematising fictions of a later day; it belongs to a period when reading and writing were widely known and practised, and when contemporaneous events were recorded on imperishable clay. The "higher" criticism has been over-hasty in its conclusions; the earlier books of the Bible are not a mere collection of inconsistent myths.

But we too must not be over-hasty in assuming that because Oriental archæology has verified the statements of Scripture where we least expected such confirmation to be possible, it has been equally decisive in vindicating the historical character of everything that is found in the pages of the Old Testament. The same evidence which has shown that the campaign of Chedor-laomer and his allies was a reality, and that Melchizedek was a historical figure, has shown also that the so-called "historical" chapters of the Book of Daniel are but examples of Jewish Haggadah. The cuneiform inscriptions of Nabonidus and Cyrus tell us explicitly that there was no siege of Babylon and no capture of the city in the time of Cyrus; the siege described in the Book of Daniel has been transferred from the reign of Darius Hystaspis to that of his earlier predecessor. "Darius the Mede" is equally unknown to contemporaneous history. Babylon was entered by the Persian Gobryas, the general of the forces of Cyrus, and it was Gobryas, the governor of Kurdistan, who was appointed by Cyrus over the other satraps of the realm. Nabonidus, so far from being the son of Nebuchadnezzar, was an usurper, and the dated contract-tablets make it certain that Belshazzar, the eldest son of Nabonidus, never became king. The archæological evidence which has dissipated the scepticism of the critics in regard to the older history of Israel has confirmed the doubts they have cast on the historical character of the narratives in Daniel.

There are many lessons to be learned from the recent history of the "higher" criticism. Chief among them is a caution against a disposition to draw positive conclusions from a single line of evidence. Let us wait until the object of our studies has been examined from all points of view, and under the light of a variety of facts. Premature conclusions, announced as final, have done more injury to science than all the attacks of her enemies. Let us again be on our guard against making our own assumptions and prepossessions the test of historical truth. Subjective criticism is full of pitfalls, and a single solid fact which can be observed and handled by science is worth more than a dozen brilliant theories. Above all, let us remember that in dealing with Biblical history we must be archæologists and historians, and not theologians. The theologian's sphere of study is large and important, but history in the true sense of the word lies outside it.

EPITAPHS IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR, D.D.

From *Good Words* (London), December, 1891.

MANY papers have been written on epitaphs, but I am not aware that anything has been written on the epitaphs in the great Minster, which, by the accidents of history, has also become our great national mausoleum. It contains many hundreds of epitaphs, and a brief consideration of some classes of them may be neither uninteresting nor unprofitable.

An epitaph, intended to be for years, perhaps for centuries, the sole remaining memorial of a person who has been in many cases honoured, and in most cases presumably beloved, is a composition which usually involves much care and consideration. Yet it is undeniable that nothing in the Abbey receives less attention than these inscriptions upon the tombs, though the tombs themselves are gazed upon with curiosity every year by hundreds of thousands of visitors ; and this is the more strange because many of these inscriptions have been written by men who were selected for their eminence and literary skill.

One chief cause for this neglect is to be found in the inordinate length of these too-often pompous and needlessly verbose eulogies. That the epitaphs are invariably eulogistic was perhaps to be expected. "Where, then, do they bury the bad people ?" asked a child, after reading in a cemetery the superhuman and exceptionless virtues of such a multitude of immaculate women and blameless men. There have been instances in which the record on the gravestone has been so notoriously belied by the memories of the life that we are not surprised at the line of the satirist—

> "Believe a woman or an epitaph."

But if we desire, as most men do, to struggle against that iniquity of oblivion which so "blindly scattereth her poppy," and to preserve, at least for a few years, the memory of our beloved, experience shows us that the *briefest* record is the most likely to be effective. A long and wordy epitaph is rarely read, and never remembered.

Not a few of the longest and most platitudinous epitaphs are exactly those which are passed by with the most entire indifference. The eccentric and pedantic Sir Samuel Morland has effectually hidden the merits of his two wives by recording them upon one tomb in Greek and Hebrew, and on the other in Hebrew and Ethiopic ! Such an inscription, as Addison said, is truly modest, for it would not be understood once in a twelvemonth. But merits may as effectually be hidden under a mountain-load of English words. Let one instance suffice out of scores which might be chosen. In the north transept is the tomb of Sir J. Balchen, who was—

> "Admiral of the White Squadron of His Majesty's fleet in 1744. Being sent out Commander-in-Chief of the combined fleets of England and Holland, to cruise on the enemy, was, on his return home in his Majesty's ship the *Victory*, lost in the Channel by a violent storm ; from which sad circumstance of his death we may learn that neither the greatest skill, judgment, or experience, joined to the most firm, unshaken resolution, can resist the fury of the winds and waves ; and we are taught by the passages of his life, which were filled with great and gallant actions, but ever accompanied with adverse gales of fortune, that the brave, the worthy, and the good man, meets not always his reward in this world. Fifty-eight years of faithful and painful services he had passed, when, being just retired to the government of Greenwich Hospital to wear out the remainder of his days . . ."

And so it goes on at interminable length with multitudes of superfluous adjectives. Of the writers of such epitaphs we can only say with Homer—

> "Foolish ! nor do they know how much more half
> is than the whole !"

Doubtless many of the persons described at such inordinate length were worthy of the applause thus bestowed on them, and it is quite natural for immediate survivors to suppose that they honour the dead by a long enumeration of their titles and offices. In point of fact, however, very few years elapse before posterity is little concerned with such details. We do not greatly care to know of John Holles, Duke of Newcastle—

"That he was Knight of the Bath and Baron Ogle in right of his mother; Viscount Mansfield, and Baron Cavendish of Bolsover, Earl of Ogle, Earl, Marquis, and Duke of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Lord Lieutenant of the counties of Nottingham and Northumberland, First Lord of the Bedchamber to King James I., Guardian to Prince Charles, Privy Councillor, and Knight of the most Noble Order of the Garter; that, for his fidelity to the King, he was made Captain-General of the forces raised for his service in the North."

Perhaps the palmary instance of unconscious vanity and incongruity in this direction is found on the bust erected by Benson to Milton, in which we have one about Milton and four or five about the small official magnificences of Benson. This curiosity should be given entire. It is—

"This bust of the Author of 'Paradise Lost,' was placed here by William Benson, Esquire, one of the two Auditors of the Imprests to His Majesty King George II., formerly Surveyor-General of the works to H.M. King George I."

If the tombs of really great men were crowded with such facts, their epitaphs would almost assume the proportions of biographies. The greatest men and women, as a rule, have the shortest epitaphs, and have been those who would care least about long ones. A few words were adequate for the good Queen Eleanor, and a line of Latin by Erasmus for the Lady Margaret of Richmond. Few greater men are buried in the Abbey than Lord Chatham. Yet these few lines suffice for the tomb, from which he seems still "with eagle face and outstretched hand to bid England be of good cheer and hurl defiance at her foes"—

"Erected by the King and Parliament as a testimony to the virtues and ability of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, during whose administration, in the reigns of Geo. II. and III., Divine Providence exalted Great Britain to a height of prosperity and glory unknown to any former age. Born November 15, 1708. Died May 11, 1778."

It was written by Bacon, the sculptor; and though George III., on hearing this, bade him stick to his chisel, there is no fault to find with it. Three or four lines also suffice for his son, "the heaven-born Prime Minister," and merely record that—

"This monument is erected by Parliament to William Pitt, son of William, Earl of Chatham, in testimony of gratitude for the eminent public services, and of regret for the irreparable loss of that great and disinterested Minister. He died Jan. 23, 1806, in the forty-seventh year of his age."

Two words, *Carolus Magnus*, were enough for Karl the Great. We know that on the grave of Wordsworth, in Grasmere Churchyard, are only the two words "William Wordsworth." Keats wished nothing else carved on his tombstone than "Here lies one whose name was writ in water." On the fine bust of Dryden, raised to his memory by the Mæcenas of literature in his day, John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, the Duke knew that it was wholly unnecessary to add anything to the words, "John Dryden, born 1632, died May 1, 1700." Already on the tomb of Spenser had been inscribed the words—

"Here lies (expecting the second coming of our Saviour Christ Jesus) the body of Edmund Spenser, the Prince of Poets in his time, whose divine spirit needs no other witness than the works which he left behind him. He was born in London in 1553, and died in 1598."

The tombs and graves and busts of Samuel Johnson, David Garrick, Isaac Watts, George Grote, Charles Darwin, Robert Browning, Charles Dickens, and others, are marked only by their names and the dates of their birth and death. On the grave of Newton are the words, *Hic depositum est Isaaci Newtoni quod mortale fuit.*

As a rule, the longest inscriptions encumber the least distinguished graves. And the worst of some of them is not only their tedious prolixity, but also their intolerable prosiness. For the splendid tomb of Mansfield, which is adorned by one of Flaxman's finest and most pathetic statues, the two lines of Pope might have sufficed—

"Here Murray, long enough his country's pride,
Is now no more than Tully or than Hyde."

His memory would have been immortalised by his great speeches, and did not need any fulsome additions, still less the prosy bathos and anti-climax which follow.

On the colossal statue of Watt, by Chantrey, placed with hideous incongruity in the chapel of St. Paul, the two words, James Watt, would have been ample; and in his case, as in many others, we might have said *Cætera historia loquatur*. Lord Brougham was, however, asked to compose the inscription, and it is as follows:—

"Not to perpetuate a name, which must endure while the peaceful arts flourish, but to show that mankind have learned to honour those who best deserved their gratitude, the king, his ministers, and many of the nobles and commoners of the realm, raised this monument to James Watt, who, directing the force of an original genius, early exercised in philosophical research, to the improvement of the steam-engine, enlarged the resources of his country, increased the power of man, and rose to an eminent place among the most illustrious followers of science and the real benefactors of the world. Born at Greenock, 1736, died at Heathfield, in Staffordshire, 1819."

In some instances, where the man has been the representative of a great cause, a longer inscription is permissible. Such is the case with those which commemorate the leaders in the great battle for the abolition of the slave-trade. Clarkson, not the least self-sacrificing of them, has not even a tablet, and the record on the arm-chair statue of Wilberforce is commonplace; but no one will regret the eloquent account of Granville Sharpe, which though the writers admit to be diffuse, they excuse on the ground that it is not panegyric but history—

"Born and educated in the bosom of the Church of England, he ever cherished for her institutions the most unshaken regard, whilst his whole soul was in harmony with the sacred strain—'Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good-will towards men;' on which his life presented one beautiful comment of glowing piety and unwearied beneficence. Freed by competence from the necessity, and by content from the desire, of lucrative occupation, he was incessant in his labours to improve the condition of mankind. Founding public happiness on public virtue, he aimed to rescue his native country from the guilt and inconsistency of employing the arm of Freedom to rivet the fetters of Bondage, and established for the Negro Race, in the person of *Somerset* (his servant), the long disputed rights of human nature. Having, in this glorious cause, triumphed over the combined resistance of Interest, Prejudice, and Pride, he took his place among the foremost of the honourable band associated to deliver Africa from the rapacity of Europe, by the abolition of the Slave Trade."

To Sir J. F. Stephen was entrusted the inscription under the bust of Zachary Macaulay, and it deserves to be remembered as a beautiful piece of English:—

"In grateful remembrance of Zachary Macaulay, who, during a protracted life, with an intense but quiet perseverance, which no success could relax, no reverse could subdue, no toil, privations, or reproach could daunt, devoted his time, talents, fortune, and all the energies of his mind and body to the service of the most injured and helpless of mankind; and partook for more than forty years in the counsels and in the labours which, guided and blessed by God, first rescued the British Empire from the guilt of the Slave Trade, and finally conferred freedom on 800,000 slaves."

No tomb in the Abbey presents so many incongruities as that erected by Queen Anne to the brave sailor, Sir Cloudesley Shovell. This bluff English Admiral is represented in his effigy half naked, partly clad in Roman armour, leaning on a silk cushion, and wearing a flowing full-bottomed wig! The inscription tells us at length of his death and shipwreck—a tragic incident little to his credit, which is represented on the bas-relief below—but says not a word of his memorable services.

Every one has noticed the extraordinary tendency to be jocose over the remains of the dead, which can alone account for the strange words on the gravestones of country churchyards. There are some approaches to these, sometimes intentional, and sometimes through unconscious dulness. Thus on the tomb of Sir J. Fullerton we read that "he died *fuller* of faith than of fear, *fuller* of consolation than of pains, *fuller* of honour than of days." Again, on the tablet to William Lawrence, a servant to one of the prebendaries, in the North Walk of the Cloisters, we read—

"Short-hand he wrote; his flower in prime did fade,
And hasty death short-hand of him hath made.
Well couth he numbers, and well-measured land;
Thus doth he now that ground whereon you stand,
Wherein he lies so geometrical:
Art maketh some, but thus doth nature all."

In the Little Cloisters we have the extraordinary remark that Thomas Smith, in 1663, "through the spotted veil of the small-pox rendered a pure and unspotted soul to God"! Quaintness of expression is common on tombs, but there are not many instances of it in the Abbey. One occurs on the tomb of Grace Scot, whose husband and father were both among the judges of Charles I.

"Hee that will give my Grace but what is Hers
Must say her Death hath not
Made only her deare *Scot*,
But Vertue, Worth, and Sweetnesse Widowers."

On the cenotaph of Samuel Butler, the author of "Hudibras," J. Barber, Lord Mayor of London, placed the not unhappy turn of speech,

"Ne cui vivo deerant fere omnia,
Deesset etiam mortuo tumulus."

In the epitaph of our great English musician Purcell, written it is said by Dryden, we are told with happy brevity that—

"Here lyes Henry Purcell, Esq., who left this life, and is gone to that blessed place where only his Harmony can be exceeded."

Less successful are Dryden's lines on Sir Palmes Fairborne, though they are historically interesting as illustrative of the dread of a Jacobite invasion in 1680—

"Ye sacred reliques which your marble keepe,
Heere undisturb'd by warrs, in quiet sleepe,
Discharge the trust which (when it was below)
Fairborne's disdaunted soul did undergoe,
And be the town's Balladium * from the Foe."

It might have been expected that Pope, so great a master of the antithetic and epigrammatic style, would have been specially successful in epitaphs; yet the only good one that he ever wrote is that on Mrs. Elizabeth Corbet, in St. Margaret's, Westminster. Those in the Abbey are without exception bad. There is a preposterous disproportionateness in his lines on Sir Godfrey Kneller—

---

* *Sic.*

> "Kneller, by Heav'n, and not a master, taught,
> Whose art was nature, and whose pictures thought—
> When now two ages he has snatch'd from fate
> Whate'er was beauteous, or whate'er was great—
> Rests, crown'd with princes' honours, poets' lays,
> Due to his merit and brave thirst of praise:
> Living, great Nature fear'd he might outvye
> Her works; and dying, fears herself may dye."

The last two lines are stolen from Cardinal Bembo's distich on Raphael. Even when addressed to Raphael, they are only excusable as reflecting the national style and idiomatic extravagance of Italy and the Renaissance; but the notion of Nature dying because Sir Godfrey Kneller had died was one which only the artificiality of an eighteenth-century poet could have accepted as otherwise than outrageous and grotesque! Pope, however, had the sense to admit that "it was the worst thing he ever wrote in his life." The same straining after false antithesis is observable in Pope's lines on Craggs—

> "Statesman, yet friend to truth, of soul sincere,
> In action faithful, and in honour clear,
> Who broke no promise, serv'd no private end,
> Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.
> Ennobled by himself, by all approv'd,
> Prais'd, wept, and honour'd, by the muse he lov'd."

And still more in the lines which he wrote for Newton's grave—

> "Nature and Nature's laws lay hid in night,
> God said, 'Let Newton be!' and all was light."

The tomb of Gay is defaced by the frivolous cynicism and impiety of his self-chosen epitaph—

> "Life is a jest, and all things show it,
> I thought so once, and now I know it."

But the last four lines of Pope's inscription are as unreal as anything can be—

> "These are thy honours; not that here thy bust
> Is mix'd with heroes, or with Kings thy dust;
> But that the worthy and the good *shall say*,
> *Striking their pensive bosoms—Here lies Gay!*"

In the lines on Rowe, the Poet Laureate, and his daughter, Pope wrote—

> "To these so mourn'd in death, so loved in life,
> The childless parent and the widow'd wife
> With tears inscribed this monumental stone,
> That hold thine ashes, and expects her own."

He was exceedingly disgusted when the last line was falsified by the speedy re-marriage of Mrs. Rowe, who is represented weeping above.

The extraordinary incapacity of Pope to recognise what was essential in an epitaph, and what was absurdly misplaced, is shown by his proposed epitaph on the monument of Shakespeare. He had been naturally disgusted by Auditor Benson's parade of his own titles on Milton's cenotaph, and had written in his "Dunciad"—

> "On poets' tombs see Benson's titles shine:"

and he had also disliked Barber's mention of his own name on the tomb of Samuel Butler. He suggested for Shakespeare's cenotaph—

> "Thus Britons love me, and preserve my fame,
> Free from a Barber's or a Benson's name;—"

as though Shakespeare would have been honoured by such ephemeral spite!

The single epitaph by Tickell on his friend Addison is more successful, and the lines are really beautiful—

> "Ne'er to these chambers, where the mighty rest,
> Since their foundation, came a nobler guest;
> Nor e'er was to the bowers of bliss conveyed
> A fairer spirit, or more welcome shade.
> Oh, gone for ever! take this long adieu,
> And sleep in peace, next thy lov'd Montague."

Among other epitaphs which contain forcible and memorable lines we may mention the following. Francis Holles, son of the Earl of Clare, died in Flanders at the age of eighteen. His epitaph is—

> "What so thou hast of nature or of arts,
> Youth, beauty, strength, or what excelling parts
> Of mind and body, letters, arms, and worth,
> His eighteen years beyond his years brought forth;
> Then stand and read thyself within this glass,
> How soon these perish, and thyself may pass:
> *Man's life is measured by the work, not days;*
> *Not aged sloth, but active youth, hath praise.*"

The following lines on the tomb of Michael Drayton, the author of "Polyolbion," are also good, and are either by Ben Jonson or Quarles—

> "Doe, pious marble, let thy readers knowe,
> What they and what their children owe
> To Draiton's name, whose sacred dust
> Wee recommend unto thy trust.
> Protect his memory and preserve his story;
> Remaine a lasting monument of his glory.
> And when the ruins shall disclame
> To be the treas'rer of his name,
> His name, that cannot fade, shall be
> An everlasting monument to thee."

The Abbey contains but two epitaphs by Lord Tennyson. One is on Sir Stratford de Redcliffe—

"Thou third great Canning, stand among our best
And noblest, now thy long day's work hath ceased,
Here silent in our Minster of the West,
Who wert the voice of England in the East."

The antithesis here is not specially forcible, and the quatrain on Sir James Franklin is more successful—

"Not here! the white North has thy bones; and thou,
Heroic sailor-soul,
Art passing on thine happier voyage now
Toward no earthly pole."

In the same chapel is the lovely monument on brave Sir Francis Vere, on whom the following epitaph is found in Lord Pettigrew's collection—

"When Vere sought death, arm'd with the sword and shield,
Death was afraid to meet him in the field,
But when his weapons he had laid aside,
Death, like a coward, struck him, and he died."

Several of the epitaphs have curious incidents attached to their history.

In the west cloister the visitor will pass a gravestone to John Broughton, who combined the double distinction of being champion prize-fighter of England, and for many years one of the vergers of the Abbey. It was from his colossal proportions and mighty muscular development that Roubiliac modelled his figure of Hercules on the tomb of General Fleming. It will be observed that there is a blank line under his name. It is accounted for by the fact that he wished the words "Champion prize-fighter of England" to be recorded under it. The Dean and Chapter objected; the decision was postponed; and as more than a century has elapsed since the man's death, we may assume that it has been postponed *sine die.*

On the tomb of John Philips, the author of the now-forgotten poems of "The Splendid Shilling" and "Cider"—which is indicated by the wreath of apple interwoven with laurels, and the motto *Honos erit huic quoque pomo*—had once been written the enormous exaggeration that he was—

Uni Miltono secundus et primo pæne par.

It might have been thought that the words would have been excluded because they express so false a literary estimate. They were, however, excluded on the very different ground that, in the judgment of the then Dean—the time-serving Bishop Sprat—the Abbey walls ought not to be disgraced by the name of Milton! On which we can only say—

"Enough! high words abate no jot or tittle
Of what, while man still lasts, shall still be true;
Heaven's great ones must be slandered by earth's little,
And God makes no ado!"

Another epitaph with a history is that on John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham. As he himself wrote it, it ran as follows:

"Dubius sed non improbus vixi;
Incertus morior, non perturbatus.
Humanum est nescire et errare.
Christum adveneror, Deo confido
Omnipotenti, benevolentissimo.
Ens entium miserere mei!"

But Bishop Atterbury, then Dean of Westminster, unwisely and unfairly struck out the words "Christum adveneror," because he said that "the verb" was not full enough as applied to Christ—who is thus left altogether unmentioned.

The inscriptions on the tombs of later days show a marked increase of taste and common-sense. They are in many cases brief, striking, and essentially illustrative of the lives and characters of those whose memory they are intended to perpetuate. This was mainly due to the genial wisdom, wide reading, and literary taste of Dean Stanley, to whom all who love the Abbey owe an inestimable debt of gratitude. He made the epitaphs not only fitting memorials of the dead, but also to be like the Hermæ at Athens, a source of instruction and moral ennoblement to all who read their lofty sentiments. Thus, under the bust of the first Lord Lawrence are inscribed the words spoken of him by a friend—"He feared man so little, because he feared God so much." On the cenotaph of John and Charles Wesley are carved three famous sayings of the founder of the Methodists:—

"The best of all is, God is with us;"

which were the words repeated by him three times, with strange energy, as he lay on his death-bed.

"I look on the whole world as my Parish,"

words which he used as a defence of the evangelistic energy of his life; and

"God buries His workmen, but carries on His work."

In a grave where rested for a time the remains of the philanthropist, George Peabody, are inscribed his best-known words—"I have prayed my Heavenly Father day by day that he would enable me to show my gratitude for the blessings which I have received by doing some great good for my fellow-men."

Another instance of a selected sentence, full of significance, may be found on the small marble tablet erected, in 1841, to the memory of Jeremiah Horrox, curate of Hoole, who, had he not died at the age of twenty-one, would probably have been as great as Newton. He was buried at Hoole and had no memorial till this humble tablet was placed by the west door two centuries after he had been the first to observe the transit of Venus. After recording mathematical and astronomical discoveries truly amazing in one so mere a boy, it mentions that his famous observation of the transit of Venus had been taken in the interval between three full Sunday services; and so far from despising these humble ministrations to the inhabitants of a poor village, he said that he was interrupted in his observations by being *ad majora advocatus, quæ ob hæc parerga negligi non decuit.*

Again, on the grave of Livingstone, which is always a point of the deepest interest to all visitors of the Abbey, are recorded the last words he ever wrote—the words which he had written in his diary very shortly before he was found by his black followers dead upon his knees.

> "All I can add in my solitude is, may Heaven's rich blessing come down on every one, American, English, or Turk, who will help to heal this open sore of the world," *i.e.*, the slave trade.

One more specimen of a most felicitous inscription is that upon the white marble pedestal of the statue of Lord Shaftesbury; the last statue added to the Abbey, and almost the last for which there will be room.

The most conspicuous epitome of the aim of his life, and the lesson of his example, is summarised in the shortest possible exhortation for a noble and unselfish career—the two monosyllables,

"LOVE. SERVE."

Certainly the two epitaphs in the Abbey which, as epitaphs, are most famous and most frequently repeated, are those on a great dramatist and an unknown little child. Every one reads with interest the well-known words,

"O Rare Ben Jonson,"

which a casual passer-by had engraved, at a cost of half-a-crown to the sexton, on the square stone under which the poet was buried upright. He has never needed any other memorial. In the cloister is a plain tablet to a little child of the classes, who died in infancy in the year of revolution 1688. "In that eventful year of the Revolution," says Dean Stanley, "when Church and State were reeling to their foundation, this dear child found her quiet resting-place in the eastern cloister. The sigh over the prematurely-ended life is petrified into stone, and affects us the more deeply from the great events amidst which it is enshrined." This is, perhaps, the only inscription of all these hundreds which recalls the pathetic, exquisite simplicity of the epitaphs in the Catacombs, which record the sorrowful bereavements of the early Christians. It is simply,

"Here lyes
Jane Lister,
dear Childe."

On Dean Stanley's own altar-tomb of alabaster is an inscription such as he himself would have approved. It gives no pompous enumeration of titles and honours, but the date of his career, and the appropriate text

> "I know that all things come to an end;
> But thy commandments are exceeding broad.'

IMPRESSIONS OF AMERICA.

BY W. J. DAWSON.

From *The Young Man* (London), December, 1891.

THE notes for this month are not written within familiar walls, and in the neighbourhood of familiar sights; my study is a Continent, and the voices which greet me are the voices of a New World. Where so much is new, and it is possible to see so little, it is difficult to speak with any exactitude of facts and impressions. From a young man's point of view I must at once say, however, that America is the land of the future. My deepest impression is one of sheer amazement at the rapidity and thoroughness with which civilisation has covered this vast continent. There is a touch of newness about everything, as one might expect; the cities still smell of the prairie. But there can be no doubt at all that for capacity, industry, and genius, America presents an unequalled sphere of action. The rush of life in England concentrates itself in about a dozen great centres at most. Here cities are literally born in a day. There is room for almost infinite expansion. With us every pathway to competence is crowded with a jostling throng; it is so here also, but with this difference, that fresh pathways are opened every day. The shadow of Malthus rests heavily over England, and large families present embarrassments and bring anxieties. Here there is so much room, that the larger the family the better. I don't mean to encourage the delusion that a man can succeed with less effort in America than Great Britain. Competition is nowhere keener than in the great cities of the States. But there are more prizes, and capacity is surer of recognition. Dunces and drones are at a discount here as at home; but the youth who is not afraid of work, and can really do some one thing better than his fellows, will here find the road open and a welcome.

In nothing is the young American so fortunate as in the great educational establishments of his country. Education is cheap and thorough. The provision for the education of women is especially notable. I recently preached the Matriculation sermon of the Women's College in Baltimore. This college is one of the most beautiful buildings in the world. Its appliances are absolutely perfect. The most efficient education that can be given is obtainable here. At what rates? £20 per annum for day scholars; £60 per annum for boarders. It is a Methodist Newnham; for I should add that it is a Methodist enterprise, and that Methodism here stands in the front rank of educational forces. With the free school and open University it is practically possible for the poorest youth to secure the finest education. In this respect Scotland is the only country that bears comparison. In Scotland the plough-boy may work his way to the University, and is not ashamed to herd cows in the summer that he may earn money to take the University course in the winter. One of my correspondents asks me where he can obtain in Great Britain the cheapest University course, and my reply is Scotland —Glasgow, Edinburgh, or Aberdeen. But what is rare with us, and is impossible in England, is common in America. America believes that the first duty of a nation is to educate its children, and it will reap its reward in the culture of the next generation.

I do not mean to say that the average American of middle life is more cultured than the average Englishman. Perhaps he is less so, though certainly he is not less intelligent. The rush for the dollar has done a great deal to materialise life. Even in ecclesiastical affairs it is common to hear men talk of three and four thousand dollar churches. Wealth is being made at almost an appalling rate in the great cities. But wealth begets leisure, and with leisure will come culture. Nor do I think that the lot of the labourer and artisan is so much better, as many people suppose. Wages are double, but the expense of life is greater. The artisan is no doubt better fed. I am not sure that he is better lodged, and certainly he pays far more for lodging, as he does for clothing. But he has more money to spend, and probably has more comfort, though even in this respect I doubt if he is much better off than the best skilled operatives of Lancashire or Yorkshire. His real advantage is in his greater opportunity for advancement. Social problems have not yet had time to make their pressure felt so keenly as in cities like London and Glasgow. The great door of the West is always open to the daring and able man. The Old World has used America pretty much as a place to dump its rubbish. It has sent over its failures, and been indignant because a sea voyage has not transformed them into successes. Therefore, I say again, that no young man is likely to succeed here who would not succeed at home. The same ability in England will win success; the only difference is that here the chance is better, and success can be more rapidly achieved.

Another thing to be remembered is that America is in no sense a New England now-a-day: in many respects it is essentially un-English. The mixture of Irish, Germans, Poles, and indeed all nationalities, has produced a distinctly new type. The hotels, the railway arrangements, the aspect of the cities, the customs and habits, are very different from the English. America at most is a continentalised England, and it is scarcely that. The Sunday newspaper is an institution. It is read by church-goers as eagerly as by other people. In Chicago there is scarcely any Sabbath observance at all. A better climate encourages a more outdoor life. In politics some of the first principles of justice have yet to be learned. The negro vote is notoriously manipulated, discounted, and even ignored. In the Southern States the negro is still visited with degrading social disabilities. At the recent Œcumenical Methodist Conference in Washington, the negro delegates could not find hotel accommodation, and were refused meals in the restaurants. White ministers of the Gospel still refuse to sit at the same table with coloured ministers of the same Church. In the Southern States special cars are reserved for coloured people, and they are not allowed to enter the ordinary car. Any gambler, profligate, or drunkard can find accommodation in the first hotels, if he be a white man; but the negro is refused admission, though he be a bishop, a scholar, a gentleman. All this is so entirely contrary to English notions, that an Englishman may well feel America to be a foreign country. There can be no doubt, however, that great changes will occur as the nation becomes more settled, coherent, homogeneous. Absolute religious equality must in the long run produce racial equality.

The thirst of the negro for education is a most noble and touching thing. In one of the schools of Baltimore may be seen an old black woman of sixty-three sitting on the same form with a child of ten. "I've not long to live," said she, "and I thought I couldn't do better than use my last years in trying to learn how to read the Bible." A little while ago an old white-headed negro presented himself before the examining board of a college in company with his only son. When the lad's examination was finished, and he was admitted to the college, the old man said, "How old do you admit people into this college?" "There's no limit in that direction," said the governor. "Could I be admitted?" "Certainly, if you could pass the examination." "Then I guess I'll be examined." He was examined and admitted. "You see," said he, "this boy's my only boy. I've taught him all he knows. I couldn't bear to think of him reading books I couldn't read, and knowing things I couldn't understand." So there the old man sits beside his son, and both will presently graduate together. Surely this is a noble incident, and an indication of the great future there is in store for the coloured people. Would that every youth in England were as eager for knowledge as that old white-headed negro!

THE "WORD OF GOD."

BY THE REV. MORGAN DIX, D.D., D.C.L.

From *The Churchman* (Epis.), New York, December 19, 1891.

"The foundation of God standeth sure."—2 Timothy ii. 19.

It was once said by Dr. Liddon that the second Sunday in Advent might almost be called the yearly festival of Holy Scripture. I intend to speak to you this morning of the extraordinary position in which we seem to be placed at the present day, on the question about the truthfulness and trustworthiness of that volume which we love and accept as the Word of God.

And first of the Old Testament: The books which make it up have been known and read for more than 2,300 years. The history of the Jewish canon is necessarily obscure; but in the old traditions of the Jewish people on this point there is no intrinsic improbability, and certainly they are much more credible than the bold inventions of their impugners. The Hebrew canon was uniform and consistent with our own; and there is ample witness to its authority and to its gradual formation in accordance with the independent results of internal evidence. The great synagogue, consisting of able and learned men of their day, determined, as is generally allowed, the canon. The volume thus set forth, as inspired and authentic, was widely known and read in the tongue of the Jews; and about 250 years before Christ, when Greek had become the speech of cultivated and civilized people, it was translated into that language. In those two tongues it was read by Jew and Gentile.

Nineteen hundred years ago, Christ came into the world; men beheld His glory, full of grace and truth, and the world changed. The Old Testament Scriptures were known to Him, as one might say, by heart. They were, to use the words of Newman Hall, our Saviour's Bible.

He made them His text-book; they were the basis of His teaching. He used them for argument, for illustration, for proof; He showed how they prophesied of Him; He expounded to His disciples in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself; He gave the Hebrew canon to His Church, with His witness to its truth; Moses, the prophets, the Psalms, were now, as it were, signed, sealed and delivered to after ages, by the infallible and divine Saviour of mankind. The apostles began their preaching with texts from these books. When St. Paul says that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures have hope, he is referring to the Old Testament as he had it then, as we have it now. When St. Peter speaks of Christ as the chief cornerstone, elect and precious, he quotes from Isaiah the prophet. They commented on passages from those sacred writings, in letters to the churches. The volume came, with its contents unchanged and unimpugned, into the possession of the Catholic Christian Church.

After some time a second volume of Holy Scriptures was added to the first; not suddenly, but after long use, and with great critical pains and care. It consisted of a collection of writings dating from twenty to sixty years after the Ascension. The history of the formation of this second volume, known as the New Testament, resembles that of the first. The books of which it is composed came by degrees into wide circulation; they were read in all parts of the Church; a clear and definite public opinion of their genuineness was formed. The honor of a place among inspired writings was cautiously conceded. Many other contemporaneous writings were rejected as apocryphal; those which finally made up the New Testament held their ground. Subjected to a thorough sifting process, continued through 200 years, at a time when the facilities for such examination were largest, and when there was no lack of profound students and scholars in the Church, they received at last, about the beginning of the fourth century, the seal of authority from councils in East and West; not as if that action made the canon; it simply bespoke a universal conviction as to the character of those books. Thus the Bible, complete in Old and New Testament, came into its present and final shape. And from those old times to our own day it has been venerated throughout Christendom as the Word of God. This is, in brief, the story of the Book, from our time back to 1,600 years ago, and back of that 700 more; and with such a record as to its authenticity and genuineness it has reached our hands.

Consider next its literary history; a history so remarkable as to throw every other of the kind into the shade. No book can be compared with the Bible, in versions, editions, and circulation. The history of those versions begins on the threshold of the third century if not before. We find the Greek of Ephesus, Athens, and Rome, the Latin of Carthage, the Coptic of Egypt, the Syriac of the East. These are the beginnings of a mighty flood rolling down to our own day. The Bible is now read in at least 300 languages and dialects. To speak of the present century only, some 200,000,000 of copies have been distributed by societies, and countless millions more by private enterprise. New translations and versions continue to appear, and in all this time no diminution has occurred in the contents of either section, and no solid ground has been shown for any important change in any part.*

As for the moral and spiritual history, it is even more wonderful than the literary. The hearts, the consciences, the intellect of vast multitudes of every race, whom no man can number, witness to the salutary and strengthening power of the Word of God. It has been indeed a lantern unto the feet and a light unto the paths of men. To speak first of the Old Testament, let me quote the words of Dr. Liddon:* "Could any merely human author have stood the test which the Old Testament has stood? Think what it has been to the Jewish people throughout the tragic vicissitudes of their wonderful history. Think what it has been to Christendom. For nineteen centuries it has formed the larger part of the religious hand-book of the Christian Church; it has shaped Christian hopes; it has largely governed Christian legislation; it has supplied the language for Christian prayer and praise. The noblest and saintliest souls in Christendom have one after another fed their souls on it, or even on fragments of it. Throughout the Christian centuries the Old Testament has been worked like a mine, which is as far from being exhausted to-day as in the apostolic age."

Of the New Testament, the same and more might be said; it seems even nearer and dearer to us than the Old; it is the production of our own household; the cherished, the sacred treasure of our Christian home.

I have said a very few words, where volumes might be written; but time permits no more than this by way of historic reminder. To pass on: The age is fruitful in strange phenomena; but one of the strangest is this: that so many persons have allowed their faith in this Book to be shaken, after all this time, and with all this evidence of its real place in the world. The disquiet, the panic, the surrender of reason and sound judgment, observable in many quarters, is generally attributed to the cogent force of what men style the higher criticism. Is there any process less worthy of confidence or respect?

As for criticism, there is one kind which is legitimate and necessary; it has been going on for more than 2,000 years, and to it we owe the text of a volume of which the original manuscripts disappeared long since. Ezra, in the fifth century before the Christian era, was no doubt a critic of that respected and honored class; so were the seventy translators at Alexandria; so were Origen and Epiphanius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Chrysostom; so was St. Jerome; and of such were Wickliffe and Coverdale, Griesbach and Tischendorf. It is the legitimate business of criticism to settle the text; and to decide questions of date and authorship, not by preconceived theory, or fancy, or prejudice, but by the canons applicable to the case; the methods are the same in all literature. This work began when the writings composing the Old Testament were collected, collated, and edited; it was carried on, in the case of the New Testament Scriptures, with assiduity and ability for three hundred years, in the face of the best scholarship of the pagan world and under incessant fire from heretical schools whose life depended on establishing their objections.

---

* See sermon by the Rev. Samuel A. Virgin, D.D., "Christ and the Higher Critics," published in "The Pilgrim," May, 1891.

* The Worth of the Old Testament: A Sermon preached in St. Paul's cathedral, Dec. 3, 1889, second edition, with a preface.

The result is seen in the place of the Bible as the Book of books, attested as such by a scrutiny to which no other book was ever subjected, and which this book has triumphantly withstood.

Now what is this shadow, this cloud, which has come over so many people today; this baleful suspicion of the chief treasure of the Church? Let us consider if it be not a result and an indication of an inveterate tendency in human nature to resist authority, to do without the light from above, and to make private opinion the final test of truth.

So long as the sacred Scriptures have been presenting their claim to attention, so long has bitter opposition to that claim been made. The claim explains that opposition; the claim, and the contents of the Book. It professes to be the Word of God to men; inspired; and therefore essentially unlike other books. It contains the history of supernatural religion. It demands faith and obedience. Such claim, profession, and demand account at once for the resistance, the opposition; they cause an inevitable recoil. The claim can only be denied by denying the character of the Book, its divine source, its inspiration in a sense in which no other book is inspired, its moral authority, its truthfulness as a record of supernatural things.

Attacks on the Book on that line have been going on ever since the Book came out with its claim, its profession, and its demand. The battle has been waged long and bitterly. In our day it is conducted with fresh vivacity, by rejectors of divine authority and deniers of supernatural religion; with hopes inspired by recent alleged scientific discoveries, and with reliance on a new and surprising method of dealing with the Scriptures. It is not now so much a question of historic testimony and exterior evidence; but the implement for settling date and authorship is human intuition. The firm ground of history is abandoned for that of theory, impression, and conjecture. The old hostility to supernatural religion and Church authority expresses itself in this new criticism. In fact, it is not new. It is a revival of the assault on Christianity by the pagans of the early centuries. It may be plainly seen in the annals of the reformation in the sixteenth century. Martin Luther was a higher critic of this type when he rejected the Epistle of St. James because he could not square with it his special theory of justification. His argument was: "I am undoubtedly right in my statement that man is justified by faith only. St. James says, 'By works a man is justified and not by faith only.' That is enough to condemn him; I reject St. James, and designate his epistle as an epistle of straw; he and I do not agree; and I must be right and he must be wrong." That is the analysis of the process by which the Scriptures are now to be dethroned from their place. Whatever that be in the Bible which cannot be squared with the prejudices, the prepossessions, the ideas of our own time, must be thrown out as spurious, or regarded as uninspired and without other than human authority. The Bible is the barrier in the way of complete license of thought on religion, and therefore the Bible must be, somehow or other, disposed of.

This process, in the shape with which we have to defend ourselves from it, began in Germany; thence it spread to France, to England, to America. It is here in full bloom, and bearing fruit after its kind. But wherever we study it, we find it, in essential features, the same.

First, it makes little if any account of external testimony and historic evidence: the conclusions of the great scholars and students, who knew and used the Scriptures from the beginning; the work of the great synagogue, and the Catholic councils; the uninterrupted and universal assent of the last two thousand years, are no weight against a prejudice existing in the critic's mind.

Secondly, It practically invests the modern critic with a power of intuitive discernment, an ability to recognize truth without any aid from historic or other facts. In examining the sacred canon, the critic has no new facts to show; yet he says, with an air of supreme authority if not of actual omniscience, "This writer was a romancer and fabulist; that writer never lived; this book was not written by him whose name it has borne between two and three thousand years; these discourses and this history were the invention of subtle priestly conspirators." And when asked how he has made these astounding discoveries, he has not a word of historic testimony to present, but he says, "My criticism proves them; modern learning establishes them; they are the ascertained results of the best thought of the day." In fact, these results, thus paraded before us in the stilted and bombastic style which we know so well come down, at last, to nothing better than guesswork and fancy; they are the fruit of difficulties which lie in the mind of the critic, and have no foundation in legitimate inquiry. They are the result of a process correctly described as "free conjecture operating upon the sacred text."

Criticism of this kind has been well stigmatized as "flimsy criticism," a species of criticism unheard of except in the case of the Word of God. An intelligent layman has well expressed himself on the last point, as follows:

"No other author, ancient or modern, has been subjected to any such ridiculous criticism; for not one of this class of critics would dare apply his system to Homer, or to Thucydides, or to any other historian. It is strange, but it is a fact, that only to ancient Hebrew literature, in the Bible, has any one ever dreamed of applying the system. It would be ridiculed by the whole world of scholarship, if applied to any other department of historical literature. And if directed toward any practical subject, in which men had immediate personal interest, it would have no currency, make no impression. But for that seeming original perversity which leads so many to wish that the Bible might be proved a fable, this modern Biblical criticism would have been recognized everywhere as flimsy and of no value—would, indeed, have had no existence." *

Thirdly, It is worthy of note, how offensive and insolent is the spirit of the modern attacks on the Bible. In a style most flippant and conceited, they brush all real evidence aside; and after we have presented full and complete historic proof of the error of their statements, they reaffirm those statements as if nothing had been or could be said against them.

Fancy a man standing up and announcing, in a dogmatic manner, that St. John did not write his Gospel, as if he had received a direct revelation of the news. He does not go on as he ought to, and tell his people what Westcott says, that "the chain of evidence in support of this Gospel is complete; that not one historical doubt is raised from any quarter." He does not refer them to Watkins, nor quote his words: "There has been no decade of any century of the Church's history, from the end of the second down to the end of the eighteenth, in which the undisputed acceptance of the fourth Gospel in the Church cannot be traced: Catholics—Anglican, Roman, and Greek; Protestants—Lutheran, Reformed, Nonconforming; tradition of the Church, consciousness of the individual, history, criticism, the practical test of use and effect in Christendom during these hundreds of years, all utter one voice." He does not, perhaps he dares not, tell his people that our great Lightfoot wrote, with dying hand, "We are compelled on critical grounds to accept this fourth Gospel as the genuine work of John the son of Zebedee." He does not tell them of Ezra Abbot and Andrew P. Peabody, and their unanswerable works in proof, on external and internal evidence, of the authorship of St. John. In fact, his is a higher criticism; much higher; by its aid men leave the solid ground and soar away on the fitful current of the uncertain wind. The authority of the Church, tradition, the verdict of the centuries, the conclusions of scholars, the preponderating weight of evidence, must yield to the higher value of a private opinion held in defiance of them all.

The question about the authorship of St. John's Gospel is but one instance of the way in which people have been fooled to-day: they are driven from their moorings on the sure anchorage of the Word of God, by bold talk and claims which cannot be maintained. Yet, were there time, it would be in order to show them how very little, at the worst, these enemies of ours can effect. Hostile criticism, after all the hard work of the last one hundred years, has been forced to partial concessions. Even the most radical of that class now admit that the Epistles to the Romans, first and second to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Galatians were undoubtedly written by St. Paul not later than twenty-five or twenty-eight years after the death of the Lord.*

Now these writings alone contain the whole Gospel, as we believe it; if it need documentary proof it has it in these, which can never again be attacked by any sane author. And again the people should consider how the Church is behind and back of the New Testament. There were no documents at all in the first age, yet the Gospel was taught as we have received it. The New Testament did not take its final shape till the fourth century; yet the Church all that time grew and spread from land to land. Her testimony as witness to the truth cannot by any effort be silenced; and we may with modesty and with confidence predict the arrival of a day of reaction, when assaults like those which we have been considering will have little or no weight with the people, and when it will take something stronger than the opinion of a skeptic to shake them from their foundation on the testimony of the Church to the value of her inherited treasures. From legitimate criticism, on the line of historic witness and external evidence, we have nothing to fear. From illegitimate criticism, on the line of conjecture and intuition, we have only to fear panic on the part of the weaker sort; but panics are brief, and early come to an end.

---

* See article by W. C. Prime, in Journal of Commerce, April 23, 1891, entitled "Flimsy Criticism.

* See the Bedell Lectures, by the Rev. David H. Greer, D.D., 1889.

There is one more point which I wish now to commend to your reflections. In this controversy over the trustworthiness of the Bible is bound inextricably and indissolubly the question as to the trustworthiness and veracity of our Lord Jesus Christ. The end of the displacement of the Bible from our lecterns as a truthful book would be the dethronement of Christ as a teacher of the truth. Questions have been raised as to the limitation of His human knowledge; we know that He grew in wisdom as well as in stature; He told us that on some points,—as on the coming of the last day,—neither He, nor the angels of heaven, had knowledge, but only the Father. But to build on such admitted facts and statements a theory which would represent Him as having been deceived by frauds and forgeries, as constantly appealing to books as little worthy of respect as the False Decretals, as drawing arguments from writings of whose spurious character men must have been aware, admitting that their origin was so recent as our critics say it was; this is to push the matter to a point at which we must deny the authority of Christ over our intellect, and dismiss Him as a teacher on whom we can depend. It is a dreadful prospect, but it is the point to which this free and flimsy criticism tends. Christ, the ignorant, the dupe of literary frauds; could He have been the only wise God, the Light, the Truth? Was He then more than a man, a fallible man, a teacher who might sit with advantage at the feet of some modern professor and learn lessons from him? It is an awful thing to put into words; but I ask you, How could you keep on thinking as you do about your Lord, trusting to His every word, feeling Him to be all that He is to you, kneeling to Him, praying to Him, commending yourself to Him for life, for death, for eternity, if meanwhile you felt you had the right, after all this, to sit down in cold blood to study the subject of the Blunders of Jesus, and His Mistakes in dealing with the Scriptures of His day, or worse, to ask yourself the question, Why, if He really knew better, He kept on speaking, and arguing and preaching as He did, but never gave a hint that the whole Jewish people had been deceived about their Scriptures, and that He intended to keep up the deception? Is this, indeed, the inner, the real meaning of much that we hear about us in very careful language, in very deceptive words, in general and loose phrases, about the assured results of modern scholarship, and the cancelling of the judgment of centuries? Does it mean that numbers are drifting into bald Socinianism, and ready to deny that Christ was and is God over all, blessed for evermore? The Old and the New Testaments belong to each other; the Old leads into the New, and the New bears witness to the Old. We accept, we love them both. We feel that to destroy confidence in either is to destroy confidence in both. The New Testament, when most vehemently attacked, has been most successfully defended. It will be so with the Old, on which the assault is to-day most violent. The battle against God's Word to man has been incessant, however that Word has come to us; it has always ended in impressing men more deeply with the wisdom of trusting to Him rather than to themselves. The foundation of the Lord standeth sure. Jesus Christ is the Infallible Word of God; and the Word of our God, by His mouth, is the truth for time and for eternity.

THE LONDON COUNCIL AND CALVINISM.

BY THE REV. T. T. MUNGER, D.D.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenom.), New York, December 12, 1891.

THE International Council is too great an event to be quickly forgotten. It was great in itself—as a meeting of the representatives of the Congregational Churches of the world. If nothing of moment had been said, the ingrafting, as it were, of the 700 churches of Sweden, the 1,300 of Madagascar, and the 71 of Japan upon the original English and American stock is to be regarded as a "great act of God." What was *said* there will not be long remembered, but what was *done* by the mere act of coming together from the ends of the earth and thus confessing one Lord and one Faith will have a vital and enduring influence.

The Council was not called to discuss theology, nor to make a doctrinal deliverance; nevertheless, theology was an ever-present theme, and was abundantly discussed in the sense that it was largely unfolded, and that theological beliefs and opinions were fully and clearly revealed. The delegates separated, pondering, not the social questions that had been discussed, nor the varying methods of ecclesiastical administration in the two countries, but the theological revelations that were made. For all men who have to do with the kingdom of God know by a true instinct that theology underlies and determines service. No effort was made to secure a declaration of faith, unless a dramatic and unauthorized scene at the closing session be regarded as an exception; but the delegates separated with as thorough a knowledge of each other's opinions as if they had discussed and adopted a creed.

The most significant feature of the Council was the relation in which it put itself to Calvinism. This was inevitable after the challenge thrown out by the opening sermon. Of this sermon I will say nothing except that it was *not* irenic, and that it was a defense of Calvinism and an attack upon modern Biblical criticism. But if it did not breathe a spirit of peace and unity over a set of men who, never having met before, and having come together for conference, presumably needed to be brought together under some inclusive truth, it served the far different but perhaps no less useful end of leading every delegate and every Congregationalist who read it to ask himself, Am I a Calvinist? No reference to the sermon was made in the Council for the simple reason that, so far as the English delegates were concerned, there was no occasion to discuss it; they were of one mind; and if the American delegates approved, courtesy forbade any protest. The sermon had this great value: it brought out the fact that English Congregationalists have so far parted with Calvinism, as indicated in the sermon, as to have no interest in it; and that Biblical criticism with them is so purely a matter of scientific investigation and common sense that it is not to be preached up or down; to denounce it is to denounce reading and writing and grammar and history. But if the sermon was not discussed, it rendered the Council sensitive to every theological utterance, and served as a fine background for the papers of Professor Simon and Dr. Conder, who repudiated Calvinism as thoroughly as the sermon called for its revival. Professor Simon's declarations were unmistakable and emphatic: "Scarcely is a passing reference now made to the divine sovereignty; the divine decrees and predestination have been exorcised; election has been metamorphosed. In dealing with *man* our starting-point is less and less distinctly the Fall, inherited depravity, guilt, and moral inability; instead we dwell on his filial relation to God, either by nature or in Christ, on the good that is to be found even in the worst, on his weakness, conflicts, sorrows, misfortunes, and assert either his freedom or blamelessness for the lack thereof. The relation of the atonement to God is chiefly one of revelation; conversion has been well-nigh converted into decision for Christ, regeneration into a process of spiritual culture. On the question of man's future destiny we are in the main divided between universalism, the doctrine of life in Christ, the Larger Hope, and various phases of a noncommittal position—the sterner views of a generation ago seem to have well-nigh disappeared." He regards these changes as amounting to "a revolution," and interprets them as "a reaction against dogma." He denies that "saving faith is the belief of saving truth," and insists that "nothing can generate and nourish Christian life but the personal action of the personal God, rendered possible through Christ's work and through faith in Christ"—views which he ascribes to English Congregationalists.

Dr. Conder spoke much in the same way. He said the Old Theology had disappeared: "Moderate Calvinism is no longer to be found in British Congregationalism. We have lost orthodoxy, but have gained Christ. The old theology did not perish under the assault of a rival system; it did not quail before a logic more rigorous than its own. It expired because an atmosphere had been created in which it could not breathe."

Such words as these, coming from able and leading men chosen to speak upon this subject, fully and fairly indicate the theological position of English Congregationalists; they have wholly broken with Calvinism as a doctrinal system. The position is, of course, in sharp contrast with our own, for, whatever our opinions may be, few have as yet discarded the name and form of Calvinism. For various reasons, or for no reason, we cling to a word and thing from which we have largely parted. Probably the overshadowing presence of Presbyterianism on one hand and the Unitarian movement on the other have served to make us timid in our utterances, and have induced us to claim an orthodoxy in name which we no longer hold in substance. For, assuredly, there are not many in New England who would subscribe to Calvinism when fairly interpreted. It is only when transformed into *zeal,* as it was by one of our delegates, or something else as remote, that it commands assent. Hence there is a certain lack of freedom and clearness of views observable here that is not seen in England. The difference is due to two sets of causes, operating in one way here, in another way there. Here we are terrorized by the huge shadow of Presbyterianism, which is organized Calvinism. A New England theologian never speaks without incurring an attack from Princeton, and the victory was always with Princeton, because it was logical in its Calvinism, while the New England man always insisted on some modifications of his own drawn from philosophy, or from common sense, which is not a recognized authority in theological controversy. The Unitarian movement, never having been rightly understood, made us timid. Instead of relaxing our orthodoxy—for such was its lesson—we intensified it and used a monition as a bugbear to frighten off all independent thinking. For half a century we have lived under the tyranny of names and epithets. It has hardly been necessary to try a minister for heresy; the accusation, well bruited by the denominational paper, was enough to kill and bury him theologically. There was one who was wise enough not to be tried and strong enough not to be killed—Horace Bushnell. Since he lived it has been somewhat easier for a man to speak his thought.

In England all is different. Congregationalists there are also overshadowed by a great Church, but its theology is practical, broad, and mild in temper, and is interpreted by catholic-minded men. While antagonizing the dissenting bodies ecclesiastically, its influence over them has been to soften their harsh beliefs and to win them toward its own. In England, also, there is closer contact with the sources of thought and movement. It is still in Europe that philosophy and theology have their origin; there is the learning of the world; there scholars and thinkers live in close and thought-breeding contact. One of the chief reasons why the theology of England is in advance of ours, or rather is more distinctly asserted, is because their social problems require it. Here our problems have not been so pressing; we have not until recently seemed to think that the Church had much to do with society and its life, but only with the individual and his destiny. Our theology and our preaching have taken form and color from personal salvation, and not from social regeneration. The transfer of emphasis is one of the causes of the changes in theology. The preacher of the Council sermon has recently said that he heard little in England of the divinity of Christ, but much of his humanity. It is because in England they feel the need of a Christ who is human; because they have learned that religion is a matter of human living, and because society is crying out for a real redemption. When one has gained such a conception of Christianity and got to living under it, he ceases to take any interest in that he has left behind. Salvation as the removal of a condemnation imposed in consequence of sin in Adam, and effected by the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, who thus assumes guilt and works out a fund of righteousness to be appropriated by believing that all this is so—to such a theology as this one never returns who has once discarded it.

This explains the attitude of the English delegates toward the outcropping of Calvinism seen in the Americans; they listened patiently but not sympathetically; and if they had spoken they would have said, You are twenty years behind us. They have reached their position, not by controversy nor through the influence of strong leaders, but by the surer process of growth and development. They have kept pace with the world; they have breathed the air of the age; they have respected learning and science; they have listened to the great men of the century—Dr. Arnold, McLeod Campbell, Maurice, Carlyle, Tennyson, Robertson, Stanley, Matthew Arnold—and, having come to their present phase of belief by so legitimate a process, they hold it with composure and strength.

My object is not so much to defend this position as to describe it, and to point out its significance and its lesson to ourselves.

In this revolution of belief our English brethren have lost their faith and yet they retain it; they have parted with Calvinism, and taken up a practical theology based on the Incarnation and having for its end a realization of the divine life in man as salvation for the individual and the true order of society. This is the achievement we are called to make—to pass from one form of the Faith to another without loss, or, if with some loss, for the sake of greater gain.

There is another lesson to be drawn from the Council—more necessary and even more plainly taught; namely, a lesson in *tolerance.* There may be some hesitation in respect to theology; there can be no question as to that which is greater than "faith and hope."

The greater, though not a disproportionate, part of our delegates were conservative in their theology—"moderate Calvinists" they would call themselves, holding to the Old Theology, and with more or less vigor opposing the New—the opposition often reaching persecution. Ministers who hold to the New Theology often have found it difficult to secure or retain their pulpits because of aspersions from their brethren; they have been shut out from the deliberations of the denomination and treated as though they had no place in it. But it is unnecessary to describe a history that is fast drawing to a close—a process that should be hastened by the experience of the Council. Our delegates found themselves face to face with a set of men who five years ago could not have passed the ordeal of an installing council unchallenged. They found themselves obliged to fellowship men holding opinions which for fifteen years they have claimed should not be tolerated in Congregational churches. In short, they found themselves in the presence of New Theology—precisely such as they had left at home; and it was overwhelmingly in the majority, and, being in the majority, the question was not how they would treat *it,* but how *it* would treat them. But there was no need of question. Tolerance is a part of New Theology; to withhold it would be as absurd as for a Calvinist to deny election. Our conservative delegates found themselves associated on terms of fellowship with a body of men who were their equals in every respect of learning and ability and piety, holding a clear and definite faith and abundantly able to give a reason for it, and as competent as themselves to declare what the faith of Congregationalism shall be, if a declaration were to be made. It is hardly possible that such fellowship should not bear fruits at home, and that the toleration rendered necessary there should not be freely accorded here. A Congregational minister is nothing if he is not logical; let us hope that it will not fail our conservative delegates when there is so fine a field for its exercise.

But something more than toleration will be gained. Variation from the old standards here has been regarded as due to some special cause in each case; to some idiosyncrasy of mind or temper, or to some special influence—local or personal. There has been a steady refusal to recognize the New Theology as a general movement. Such a view can no longer be held by those who have seen the Congregational churches of Great Britain. No candid mind can fail to see that the movement here and there has been one and the same; there and here it is a reaction against the Old Theology, induced by the same causes and pointing to the same ends. It would seem impossible that this movement should be spread out so clearly as it was in the able papers of Professor Simon and Dr. Conder and Professor Stearns, and intimated no less clearly in the opening address by Dr. Dale, as embracing the working theology of the English delegates and the Gospel they preached by and lived by, without making a profound impression on the minds of the American delegates. If such an impression was made, it is not difficult to tell where it will lead. As pity is akin to love, so toleration is akin to acceptance. But if this is too much to look for at present, we may rejoice in the assurance that a spirit of tolerance will henceforth pervade the Congregational churches of our country. If not, the London Council will have stultified itself in its American delegates.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ON HELL.

BY RT. REV. MGR. DE CONCILIO.

From *The Freeman's Journal* (R. C.), New York, December 12, 1891.

THERE IS AN ABSOLUTE ETERNAL PUNISHMENT FOR MORTAL SIN; THERE IS THE POSSIBILITY OF A SUSPENSION OF GOD'S JUDGMENT FOR CERTAIN ENDS IN SOME CASES; THERE IS NO SPECIAL DECISION AS TO THE NATURE OR SUBSTANCE OF THE PUNISHMENT, BUT THE DENIAL OF THE BEATIFIC VISION, THE EVERLASTING IMPERATIVE CRAVING OF THE UNSATISFIED SOUL, EXCEEDS THAT OF MATERIAL FIRE.

ST. MICHAEL'S RECTORY, JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Editor of the New York Freeman's Journal:

DEAR SIR: Since the "Presbyterian tangle," as the New York *Sun* has very aptly called it, I have been asked several questions, from Catholics as well as non-Catholics, upon some of the most important topics connected with the controversy. I have endeavored to reply to them to the best of my ability. Will you permit me to ventilate them briefly in your valuable paper? They may do good to many a soul seeking for truth.

The first question is about eternal punishment. I have been asked, Does Catholic doctrine allow any let up with regard to the eternal punishment of those who die in mortal sin, that is, absolutely estranged from God, and with their will obdurately attached to things in utter opposition to the moral law? The answer to this is: Catholic doctrine admits for such as those I have mentioned a punishment absolutely eternal, that is, lasting forever, without any redemption whatever. The reason for such doctrine is twofold. First, true revelation, as made to God's Church and as always held and maintained by the same. Second, our own reason. The most essential attributes of God are involved in that question. A man whilst in life may defy God and His law at his own pleasure. He dies in that defiance, and that criminal bent of his will, that obduracy in sin, that perverseness remains and is carried by him into the next life. He stands before God as a rebel, defying and hurling, as it were, insults and blasphemy at Him. Suppose God were obliged to take such a rebel to His embraces, what would be the consequence? Who would be the master in this conflict, God or the criminal? Evidently the criminal. Who can fail to see that God's independence would be gone, that He would be the slave and man the master? And what kind of a God would He be who were forced to submit to a perfidious, obdurate rebel? The very existence, then, of God is involved in the doctrine of eternal punishment. If a man leaves this world in a state of criminal opposition to God and to His law, let him remain so and take the consequences. No compromise, therefore, can be made as to the doctrine of everlasting punishment.

The second question which I have been frequently asked is: Is there any redemption allowed to any one dying in the state of mortal sin? In other words, is any one after death allowed any time to change and to be freed from that punishment? Catholic doctrine answers, No, as a general rule applied in the universality of cases. But it allows the possibility of some having died in mortal sin and who, by a special providence of God, have had their final judgment suspended until it pleased the same God, for some special end, known to Him, to dispose of them. Second, that which has happened to some may happen also to some others. It is the common doctrine of theologians that such was the case with all those who after being dead were restored to life by the prophets of old, by our Blessed Lord, by His apostles and by all God's saints. Some of those may have died in mortal sin; their final judgment was suspended because they were to be restored to life for the glory of God and the propagation of His kingdom. Now, it is a doctrine of Catholic theology, also, that all those who by a miracle of God were benefited as to their bodily welfare were also and more especially benefited as to their spiritual welfare. Therefore, if any of those who were restored to life had died in mortal sin, they were not left to die until they had put their will in conformity with the moral law and made their peace with God.

A third question is frequently: In what does hell really consist in? Catholic doctrine teaches neither more nor less than that hell is a state of everlasting punishment. This eternal punishment, as understood by the Church and all the Fathers and Doctors, consists in the eternal privation of the beatific vision of God and the consequences which depend upon the same privation. We say, consequences depending upon that privation, because the end of the rational creature is the beatific vision. The eternal happiness, therefore, of the same rational creature consists in the attainment of that vision. Once that vision is lost the rational creature has lost its end, its destiny and its happiness. It is a being out of its centre at war with its most imperative cravings. It is a living contradiction. This implies a psychological pain worse than anything which could be imagined. This is all that any one is bound to believe touching hell. With regard to all other questions the Church has made no definition whatever. Hence, first, whether hell is a peculiar place or not we are not told by any definition; second, neither are we bound to hold that in hell there is actual sensible fire as an instrument of inflicting pain. This, not on account of there being any contradiction in supposing that a material fire could affect a spiritual principle, because such supposition cannot be maintained in the presence of the fact of our perceptions affecting our souls, but because God's Church has defined nothing about the matter. Third, as to the intensity of pain the Church is also silent and leaves us free. We are also free to maintain consistently with Catholic teaching that God's mercy may from time to time assuage and alleviate the pains of the damned in the manner in which, in His infinite wisdom, he shall see fit. Also we are at liberty to indulge in the hope that under the same infinite mercy that pain may be diminished, provided we maintain that it can never cease, but must endure for eternity.

This, in a few words, is what Catholic

doctrine has taught with regard to hell. It will be seen when well examined and carefully meditated upon, it can stand the test of the severest criticism, that it is in full conformity with the reason, that, unless we distort and change the nature of sin and moral delinquency, we find that hell is but the necessary consequence of the same, made everlasting; because in the next world no rehabilitation is possible under the general rule of Providence. Nor does this doctrine just as explained have any tendency to lessen the horror of that state. It might for those who cannot rise above the material and the sensible, but for such as can conceive the state of a rational being which has lost its destiny and its end forever, a destiny toward which it tends with all the intensity of its craving; for one who can conceive how such a being is placed in an unnatural state, a state of internal violence with itself, then one can easily perceive that all the horrors of hell fire are child's play to that state of internal and everlasting warfare, of imperative craving left bleeding and unsatisfied. Yours in Christ,

J. De Concilio.

JOHN WESLEY'S "CHAPEL."

From *The Church Times* (Ch. Eng.), London, November 20, 1891.

John Wesley's "City Road Chapel," which has just been restored and decorated at great cost by the Wesleyan Methodists, is henceforward to be known as "John Wesley's Chapel." The last word has given rise to some searchings of heart and much controversy among the Methodists. In all other parts of England the Methodists, like the other sects, are erasing the word "Chapel" from their notice boards and substituting the word "Church." A writer in the *Methodist Recorder* complains of "the uncertainty and diversity" produced by this change of substantives. In the town where he lives there are two Methodist preaching-houses; one is called a "chapel," and the other is called a "church." He tells a story of a Wesleyan servant-maid in another town who was perverted from "the Church of her fathers" by this new legerdemain which is converting the chapels into churches. She went out one Sunday night intending to go to the Wesleyan chapel, but she could not find one as they had all become "churches," so she went to a Congregationalist meeting-house. The writer entreats the authorities of his sect to decree that all its preaching-houses shall be called "chapels" or that all shall be called "churches." The Rev. W. Scarborough, at the recent opening of a rebuilt Wesleyan preaching-house at Whitby, told the people that it was "a new church built on the site of an old chapel." By what ecclesiastical process does the builder convert a chapel into a church? Does brick make it a chapel and stone make it a church? or is a Georgian building a chapel, and a Gothic building a church? The President of the Conference has given his reasons, we are told, for preferring the word "chapel" to the word "church." We have not read them. But it is curious that the Conference should have officially refused to give the name of a "church" to "the only Nonconformist place of worship that may be looked upon as having anything approaching to a cathedral position"—so the *Methodist Recorder* says of the City-road Chapel—and should have officially desired that it shall be called henceforward John Wesley's "Chapel."

That was the name which Wesley himself, for reasons which the modern Methodists very well know, gave to the building. He built it as a "Nonconformist" chapel, but not as a Separatist or Dissenting chapel, which it now is. The "Nonconformists," in contradistinction to the Dissenters or Separatists, always claimed to be members of the Church of England; that is the reason why, as Richard Baxter again and again explained, they scrupulously refused to give their buildings the name of "churches," and in all cases called them "chapels."

In the *Nonconformist's Plea*, published in 1679, Baxter said:—

> The most of our acquaintances take it their duty to do their best to keep up the reputation of the publick conformable ministry, and the success of their labours with the people. And they profess to take their own assemblies *but as chapels*, and not as distinct, much less as separated *churches*. And those of them who do administer the Sacraments, and do that which is like the Separatists' way, yet do it not on their principles: it being reformed and well-ordered parish churches, under the government and countenance of the Christian magistrate, which are most agreeable to the Nonconformists' desires.

This was the original meaning of the word "chapel" as applied to a building not directly belonging to the Church of England, nor under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese and the priest of the parish. The Nonconformists expected that as soon as their powerful aristocratic and plutocratic patrons could secure the "comprehension" of their ministers in the National Church, all these "chapels" would become the property of the Church. The

Separatists or Dissenters (the Independents, Baptists, and Quakers), did not at first give the Popish and anti-Christian name of "chapel" to their buildings. They preferred to call them meeting-houses.

John Wesley was much more of the High Churchman than Richard Baxter was, though he was extremely like Baxter in his amazing individuality and self-sufficiency. We use both words in their best sense. He laid the foundation stone of the City-road Chapel in 1777, and opened it in 1778. It was not an isolated ecclesiastical phenomenon of the period. There were other huge London chapels at that time, all of them now in possession of Dissenters or Separatists, which were founded upon this original Nonconformist principle that they were neither to belong to the Church nor to the Dissenting foes of the Church. Wesley's great chapel (unless we take the Foundry as its predecessor) was preceded by Whitefield's "Tabernacles" in Moorfields and Tottenham Court-road, and it was followed by Rowland Hill's great Surrey "Chapel" in the Blackfriars-road, which was opened in 1783. Even Rowland Hill protested that he was not a Dissenter, and again and again expressed a wish that his successor in his "chapel" should be a clergyman of the Church of England, and not a Dissenting preacher. It was Rowland Hill's own individualist and pontifical property. He was resolved that it should not come under episcopal or parochial jurisdiction, and yet should not be a Dissenting conventicle. Hence he hoped that he should find some English priest "of our own Establishment," as he called the Church, who, "panting for more liberty," would be tempted to accept "the preferment of Surrey chapel." The fates of Whitefield's Tabernacle and Rowland Hill's Surrey chapel are instances how the Independent sect has grown, which has not been by its own inherent forces, but by its outward and accidental inheritance of buildings and funds which were never intended to be used for Independent purposes—least of all to be fortresses set up against the Church. If Wesley, or even his Calvinist and less Churchly opponents, Whitefield and Hill, could have foreseen to what purposes their chapels would in the end be perverted, it is very doubtful whether they would have built them.

The Wesleyan preachers, at the reopening of Wesley's City-road chapel, said many bitter things against the Church of England. But the hatred of the preachers to the English Church seems to be not near so bitter as is their spiteful railing at the young folk of Methodism, who leave "the Church of their fathers," the Wesleyan or Methodist Sect, for the Church of their grandfathers, their parish, their diocese, and their fatherland. Considering that it is only in this present year 1891 that the heads of the sect have discovered and decreed that the sect is not a "society," but is a "Church," and have only just officially altered their title to fit it to this discovery, they are rather hard upon the young men and women for not having been beforehand in this discovery. But the real sting of the "drift" of the better educated Wesleyans from their sect to Wesley's Church lies in the fact that the preachers know that the young folk are following Wesley's own counsels. Not a preacher amongst them, at the reopening of Wesley's Chapel, from the President downwards, would have had the courage to re-deliver to his assembled fellow-preachers Wesley' own solemn charge to their predecessors. And yet, if they be really "Mr. Wesley's preachers," as they suppose they are, the charge is as binding upon them as it was upon their predecessors. The *Methodist Recorder* seems to fear that it may be quoted, for it urgently cautions its readers to be on their guard against "the misrepresentations of Wesley's life and work by High Church speakers and writers." The truth is, the modern Wesleyan Methodist is in as great a terror of Wesley's own words as the Pope and the Anglican Church, or the Eastern Bishops, are supposed to be of the words of Holy Scripture. The Conference ought to revise Wesley's writings in the interests of the new Wesleyan "Church," and solemnly condemn and burn everything in them which is awkward for the "Forward men." What can be more awkward than the charge which the patriarch of Methodism addresses to President Stephenson and "the Wakener of the West," as the *Pall Mall Gazette* calls the Sunday preacher of St. James's Hall? "Warn the people," says John Wesley to the Wesleyan preachers, "against calling our society a Church, or the Church, or our preachers ministers." He foresaw and weighed all the arguments which they would urge for schism, and therefore said to them in the same address: "Ye have, and will have, a thousand temptations to set up for yourselves. Regard them not. Be Church of England men still."

John Wesley was too clear a thinker not to know that men cannot make a private religious "society" into a "Church," or "the Church," simply by voting that they will henceforward call it a "Church." There can be but one Church. This Church God has made once for all by His Son, and into it He incorporates men and women, not by their votes and resolutions that they will call themselves "a Church," but by His Spirit, through the Sacrament of Baptism. If Mr. Wesley's preachers and their hearers are members of the one Church, it is because they are baptized, and not because they are Wesleyans. The very name "Wesleyan Methodist Church" would have filled Wesley's soul with horror. "Let all our preachers," said he, "go to Church." He added no codicil to release Mr. H. P. Hughes and the "Forward men." That by "Church" he did not mean his own Chapels, as they may casuistically affect to believe, is clear from his own further emphatic explanation of his meaning. "Alter all plans that will interfere therewith. Let all their people attend Church constantly, and receive the Sacrament every opportunity. Our service is not designed to be instead of the Church service." On the very year in which John Wesley died, one of the preachers, Thomas Taylor, agitated for the violation of his will and plan. Taylor had been educated as a Presbyterian, and had learned the Assembly's Catechism by heart when he was four years old. In spite of the opposition of those whom he called "the Church party" in the society, he opened the new chapel in Liverpool during church hours. He tells us in his diary that he showed them that it was "scriptural and reasonable. All they could say was, that it was the old plan (not to set up Methodism as a schism) and that God had blessed it, and that John Wesley had said, if the Methodists leave the Church, God would leave them." Taylor's next step, as he saw the Methodists still go to church for Holy Communion, was to usurp the priest's office. "Though I had been a preacher thirty years or more," said he, "yet I had never received any formal ordination by the imposition of hands. And although I believed it lawful, yet I did not think it expedient to celebrate the Lord's Supper without some formality of that kind I submitted to a formal ordination." Whence he obtained this mere form we know not. But his case is an early specimen of the small regard paid by the self-exalting preachers to Wesley.

THE CONVERSION OF CHILDREN.

BY REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER, D.D.

From *The Examiner* (Bapt.), New York, November 26, 1891.

THE most important ten years of human life are from six to sixteen years of age. An enormous proportion, perhaps a majority of people, who pass twenty-one irreligious are never converted at all. Mr. Spurgeon says that the most healthy Christians in his church are commonly those who began to serve Christ when they were young. Such has been my experience and that of many other pastors. Yet some very worthy Christians are strangely skeptical in regard to the conversion of children—especially their own children.

In my humble opinion, if a child can love its parent, and trust its parent, and obey its parent, it can love and trust and obey God. These three mental acts are the very essence of Bible-piety. An ordinary child of ten years can appreciate the story of Christ's life, his deeds of mercy, the sweetness of his promises, and the meaning of his death for sinners, about as well as a man of threescore. A child can love the Lord Jesus with all the ingenuous ardor of its young heart; and in every thought and act towards Christ that child may have the supernatural aid of the Holy Spirit. Just as soon as your son and daughter are old enough to understand right from wrong, they are old enough to do right or wrong. Doing right is a religious act; doing wrong is sin. Sorrow for wrong-doing is contrition. Ceasing to do wrong, from right motive, is repentance. Asking Christ to forgive wrong is an act of faith. Keeping Christ's commandments is the very core of Christianity. Surely, there are innumerable instances in which children have exhibited all these "fruits of the Holy Spirit." Some of the most beautiful examples of deep and fervent piety that I have ever witnessed have been displayed by hearts that were under twelve years of age.

It may be said that "children's minds are volatile and changeable." So they often may be, and therefore require all the more of wise and careful handling. But are grown people never changeable? Do men and women of forty years old never become backsliders? I had rather risk the volatility of childhood than the temptations to self-seeking sharpness and worldliness that beset middle life. If childhood is credulous, manhood and old age are too apt to be skeptical. Better a heart that believes too much and too easily than one that is too slow to believe and to move at all. Oh, be assured, all ye pastors and parents and teachers, that there is no such soil in the world for religious truth and converting grace as the heart of a frank and susceptible and teachable child. From such soil often grows the loftiest and sturdiest piety of after years.

"Those that are planted in the house of the Lord flourish in the courts of our God."

When Become Church Members.

At what age should a child be admitted to the church? To this question the answer is that every one should be admitted to Christ's Church as soon as they give good evidence of Christian character and conduct. The church is for all who love the Lord Jesus and who seek to serve him. The Bible never makes age a condition of salvation. Shall a truly regenerated child be kept away from Christ's table until it has got over being a child? And what is the use of having a fold if the lambs are all to be kept out until they can stand rough weather?

Great care should be exercised in the admission of children into the church. Haste and injudicious handling may work a mischief that cannot easily be repaired. Not only should there be good evidence that the "root of the matter" is in the young heart, but the solemn and far-reaching step should be fully explained and thoroughly understood. In no direction is there more danger of sad blundering than in dealing with the souls of children. Sunday-school teachers often commit the most lamentable mistakes; and I have known some itinerant evangelists to pursue processes that were as absurd as they were mischievous. For example, several years ago an eminent "children's preacher" held some special services in a church not far from mine. He got together a crowd of Sunday-school youngsters, addressed them in an impassioned style, and then asked, "How many of you want to be Christians? Who of you loves the Lord Jesus?" Those who "rose up" or remained to be prayed with, were at once ticketed by this impulsive revivalist as young converts. He said to me at the end of a week of this hot-bed process, "I have had one hundred conversions in Mr. B——'s church." After a few months I asked Mr. B—— how many of those young "converts" gave good evidence of sound conversion? He replied, "Not over a dozen." Fortunately, the pastor was not so headlong as to rush all these crude cases into church membership. From long observation I have become convinced that the wholesale process of dealing with children is a monstrous mistake that is often fraught with most deplorable results.

In the recently published biography of that eminent servant of God, Professor Austin Phelps, is a most suggestive account of his own experience when he was twelve years old. He says: "There was a revival of religion" (in his father's church) "which affected me powerfully for the time. I went through the usual excitement of such scenes, attended children's prayer-meetings, took prominent part in them, prayed much in secret, and thought of little else than the salvation of my soul. If any one at that crisis had kindly diverted my thoughts from the idea of regeneration to that of simple right living in the ways natural to a child, I think I might then have become a child of God. What I needed was to be made to believe in truth-telling, honesty, honor, unselfishness, care for the happiness of others as well as love to God and trust in Christ as Christian things. I had no conception of them as such. I longed for, and prayed for, and—worst of all—waited for some sublime and revolutionary change of heart; and what that was as a fact in a child's experience I had not the remotest idea. My belief is that hundreds of older people turned to God in that revival. But I have yet to learn of one of my own age who was at all benefited by it. To me it was an unmitigated evil, hardening my religious sensibilities, and the prelude to a period of worldliness in which I lived without prayer."

Professor Phelps was not only a brilliant scholar, but a devout and orthodox theologian, and his testimony here is of great value on two important points. He emphasizes the importance of ethical instruction with children. To ask a child only these questions "Do you love Christ?" and "Do you want to be a Christian?" and then fail to tell them that the only proof of that "love" is that they aim to keep Christ's commandments is a fearful mistake. It is an appeal to the emotions and not to the conscience, and it is likely to end in a thin, vaporous religion, or in a reaction towards hardness of heart. Conduct is the main idea to be kept before a child's mind, and when the Holy Spirit is doing a genuine work on that child the result is seen in making that child a better boy and a better girl in the home, in the school, in its plays, and everywhere else. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The other important point is that in a revival, no one needs more wise and careful and prayerful handling than the young and susceptible. They are so liable to be carried away by currents of sympathy or else misled by well-meaning but injudicious bunglers. The wholesale process of dealing with them in the mass—whether by an evangelist, or a pastor, or a Sunday-school superintendent—is fraught with prodigious dangers. Each child should be dealt with individually, and according to its peculiar temperament and surroundings. A parent is God's appointed trustee of a child's soul, and a Christian home is God's ordained training-school. When the child has no such home-influence, then the pastor and the Sunday-school teacher should fervently pray for common sense and divine direction, as well as for loving patience, while they are attempting to guide childish hearts to Jesus and to a true Christian life.

WHERE WAS PARADISE SITUATED?

BY PROFESSOR DR. FRITZ HOMMEL.

From *The Sunday-School Times* (Undenom.), Philadelphia, December 5, 1891.

LIKE the vibration from a lost bell, there comes down to us from the remotest past, in the traditions and tales of ancient peoples, the knowledge of a long-vanished, happy childhood of the human race. A wondrous garden, watered by four rivers, with the tree of knowledge (the tree of life of the Babylonians) in its midst, and therein man walking still in the state of innocence in immediate intercourse with his Maker,—this is the pith of those traditions which the Bible has preserved for us in simple beauty, and, as compared with others, in the purest and most faithful account.

"Thereupon," says the oldest narration in the Scriptures (Gen. 2 : 8 ff.), "Jahveh planted a park in Eden [that is, in the hitherto waste and unplanted plain ; Babylonian *edinu*] in the [far] East, and brought thither the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground Jahveh made to grow trees of all kinds that are pleasant to see and bear well-tasted fruits. And in the midst of the garden the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And a river went forth from Eden for watering the garden, and from thence it was parted into four heads. Then Jahveh took the man and put him into the Garden of Eden to till it and to keep it,"—and so on to Genesis 3 : 21.

The purpose of this paper is to show how exactly we can ascertain that the ancient Hebrews conceived of Paradise as in South Babylonia, at the mouth of the Euphrates and Tigris. If we examine more closely the Bible passage Genesis 2 : 11–14, it will appear, first of all, that, in spite of the express mention of the Tigris and the Euphrates, the matter is not as simple as might appear at first sight.

"And a river took its rise from Eden to water the garden, and from thence it parted, and that into four branches" (literally, "heads," or "sources"). To this passage, which we have translated already above, is joined, as a more exact explanation of the site of the garden, the following : "The name of the first is Pishon, that is it which encompasses the whole of Khavîla, where there is gold, and the gold of that land is good ; there also are found Bedolakh-resin and Schoham-stones. And the second river is called Gikhon ; that is it which encompasses the whole of Kush. And the third river is called Khiddeqel ; that is it which flows along Asshur. And the fourth river is the Pĕrat" (Babyl. *Purattu*).

Clear as it is that the Khiddeqel (or Tigris, strictly *ghid-Deqel*, Assyrian *Diqlat*, Arabic *Dijlat*) and the Euphrates in this connection point us to some province of Mesopotamia or Babylonia, it is just as hard to define that more exactly by the further details. These hitherto have been misunderstood, and thus have called forth an abundant literature on the theme "Where was Paradise Situated ?" The way from the mountains of Armenia, in which both the Euphrates and the Tigris take their rise, down to the Persian Gulf, into which they both flow, is a long one, as everybody knows. The quite long and at the beginning extraordinarily wide territory, through which these two rivers pass from their source to their mouth, hardly can be identified with Paradise. But in what part of this extensive region was it that Hebrew tradition saw the garden of God ? Was it in the wild highlands of Armenia, where, besides the Euphrates and the Tigris, the Araxes and the Halys take their rise ? Or was it Mesopotamia, where, however, we should seek in vain for a Pishon or a Gihon ? Or was it the northern part of Babylonia, where at one point the Euphrates and the Tigris draw so near each other that in times of flood they seem, in fact, to form but a single stream, and where canals large enough to be regarded as two other rivers branched off east and west from the Euphrates ? Or, finally, was it the southern part of Babylonia, lying on the Gulf of Persia, where two rivers pouring in from Elam, the Kherkhah and the Karoon, might be thought, and actually have been thought, to be the Pishon and the Gihon ?

Of the many attempts to answer this interesting question, two are especially worthy of attention, as the only two which have been made with the full equipment of science for the undertaking. The first is that by the eminent Assyriologist, Friedrich Delitzsch, in the first part of his work, "Where was Paradise Situated?" ("*Wo lag das Paradies?*" Leipzig, 1881), in which, following the example of Augustin Hausdorf, he decides for Northern Babylonia, and labors with great acuteness to prove the identity of the Pishon with the Pallakopas Canal, that of the Gihon with the Arakhtu or Shatt en-Nil, also a Euphrates canal,—the former on the Arabian, the latter on the eastern or Babylonian side of the Euphrates. The second is that of the famous Arabian traveler, Eduard Glaser, which, in the recently published second volume of his highly important book "Sketches of the History and the Geography of Arabia" ("*Skizzen der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens.*" Berlin, 1890), endeavors to prove Southern Babylonia to be the only possible and imaginable site of Paradise according to the Hebrew—and, we may add, the old Babylonian—conception of the matter. And this he does in a way quite new, and hitherto never suggested.

Both scholars regard as decisive the definite statement of the Bible with regard to the Pishon and the Gihon, that they flow around the lands of Khavîla and Kush. Upon the right location of the latter depends, first of all, the right decision of our question.

But before examining the situation of Khavîla and Kush, we must look closer, for an instant, at the exact sense of that introductory statement, "And a river went forth from Eden to water the Garden, and from thence it was parted and became four heads." By "head" the Shemites, both in Hebrew and Babylonian Assyrian, designated the source of a stream. Now, in ordinary experience, a new stream is formed out of several source-rivulets; but never, in reverse fashion, does a stream, in the course of its flow, become a plurality of sources. It is sufficiently clear, therefore, that the word "heads" cannot be taken in its primary sense, but stands poetically as the part for the whole,—the head for the stream itself,—so that the passage only means that a stream—probably the greatest of those already mentioned, the Euphrates—arose in Eden, and in its long course, when near to its debouchment, received four—or, counting itself, three—other streams, forming with these a single river. And here we must not insist too much on the term "arose," or, literally, "went out from," as *edin* has for its first sense the plain, the depression, the wilderness; and in this the Euphrates does not take its rise, although it flows through it. Or, as there still remain difficulties in the statement, and we must admit an obscurity in the mode of expression of the biblical writer, if not a corruption of the text, we may follow Glaser's explication of the passage (in page 320 of his book), that this branching off is to be understood as though we were proceeding up stream. The simple sense, then, is that farther down than Paradise lay there was a place of the union of four streams, whose waters were a blending of all four of the confluents. But, whichever may be the exact sense of the verse in question, it is quite beyond doubt that the writer of verses 11–14 had the idea of four streams which somewhere flowed into one, or at least emptied into the sea at no distance from each other, and that these did not flow around Paradise itself,—for in that case Khavîla, Kush, and Asshur must have been portions of Paradise,—but in some part of their course touched it.

Now for Khavîla and Kush themselves. Professor Friedrich Delitzsch had already taken a long step forward, when he ceased to look for Khavîla beyond the Arabian peninsula almost as far as India, as entirely contrary to the sense and connection of the other passages of the Old Testament which treat of Khavîla. But Eduard Glaser was the first to define the conception more exactly. This excellent, but hitherto so little assisted, student and explorer of Arabia, furnishes a completely convincing proof, in his "sketches," that Khavîla does not designate, in a general way, the Arabian wilderness bordering on Babylonia (as Delitzsch supposed), but in every passage means one and the same district; namely, the mountain clump of Yemâma, with its extensions north-west and south-west, therefore Central and Northern Arabia bordering on it. With this best agrees, in addition to the products, especially gold, named in Genesis 2 : 12, the placing of Khavîla, in Genesis, 10 : 29, between Jobab and Ophir, which latter Glaser, in a long excursus, shows to be Bahrein, on the Persian Gulf. Another confirmation of this view is found in the mention, in Genesis 10 : 7, of Khavîla among the sons of Kush immediately after Seba, which is not the same as Sheba, or Saba, in South Arabia, but, according to Glaser, is to be sought rather in Jebel Shammar, made known to us by Lady Blunt's travels. Finally, it is confirmed by the designation, in Genesis 25 : 8 and 1 Samuel 15 : 7, of the boundaries of the Ishmaelites as extending "from Khavîla unto Shûr that is before Egypt;" that is, in the northern part of the Peninsula of Sinai.

Even more interesting is the farther proof, by Glaser, of a great wady, or river-valley, of Yemâma, the Wady ad-Dawâsir, a part of which was called *Faishân,* which would read *Pêshôn* in Hebrew, and which used to flow into the Persian Gulf, but which, according to the ancients (Pliny and many Arabs), found its outlet rather into the Euphrates. That certainly was also the opinion of the ancient Hebrews. Even if the name Faishân were no longer to be traced in this connection, yet the biblical Pishon could, in fact. be nothing else than the wady running through the Yemâma-Khavîla. So much the more striking, however, is the proof of Glaser's accuracy through what he has brought forward with regard to this very name.

As regards the land of Kush, and the Gihon, which flowed around it, the old error that Kush in the Old Testament always means Ethiopia, has been fatal to a correct understanding of the matter. Friedrich Delitzsch was the first to break this bound, as he brought forward the Kossæan, called by the Babylonians the Kash, in the mountains lying northward from Elam, as explaining both the passage under consideration and also Genesis 10 : 8 ("And Kush begat Nimrod"). But he went too far in transferring the name Kash to Babylonia, on the ground that the Kossæans gave the Babylonians a dynasty which ruled it for several centuries, and in identifying the Gihon with the Arakhtu Canal, which flows through Central Babylonia, and was called by the Sumerians the Gukhan-di. It was an error to say that the name Kush ever was applied to Babylonia simply because kings of Cossæan stock reigned there in the second millenium before Christ. On the contrary,—as I was the first to show,—the Cossæans were the nearest kindred of the Elamites, and even almost identical with them. And it becomes more and more probable that Elam as a whole—not excepting the region north of it, known to the classic Greek writers and the inscriptions of the later Assyrian kings as the country of the Cossæans—was called Kash in earlier times. According to this, our Kush (originally Kôsh derived from Kâsh), is the same as Elam; and the Gihon is the Kherkhah, which rises in the Cossæan mountains, flows past Susa, and now empties into the Tigris below its union with the Euphrates, but which in ancient times perhaps found an outlet directly into the Persian Gulf.

It is true that the country of the Arabian Cushites meets the needs of the case equally well. This was the Jebel Shammar to the Persian Gulf, along with the Wady Rumma,—a river-valley which, according to the Arabs, originally found its outlet into the Euphrates, as did the Wady ad-Dawâsir, or Faishân; that is, the Pishon. Glaser, with whom the suggestion is original, prefers this possibility, and calls attention to the fact that the Arabic poets knew of a Gaihân in this neighborhood, which afterwards lapsed out of recollection. In this he sees just the old name of the Wady Rumma. In this view of the matter, the Gihon also (originally Gêhôn, from Gaihân) is to be found in Arabia. It is here not the place to follow into detail the suggestions of Glaser's "Sketches," especially his expositions which cast a new light on ancient geography and history, and which show the movement of a Kushite colonization first from Kash-Elam to Arabia, and then across the Red Sea, whose final results were the giving to Nubia the names Ethiopia and Kush, and—as I shall show elsewhere—an extensive Elamite influence on the languages of Northwestern Africa.

But it is the old Babylonian mythology which supplies the best evidence that Southern Babylonia, where the four streams, Euphrates, Tigris, Wady ad-Dawâsir, and the Wady Rumma (or else the Kherkhah) find their outlet, was the locality accepted by the old Hebrews as the site of Paradise. On the lower Euphrates, somewhat east of Ur, but on the Babylonian, not, like Ur, on the Arabian, bank of the river, there stood the holy city Nun-Ki, or Eridu, the center of the oldest religious views of the Sumerians. In the neighborhood of this place, a Sumerian formula of incantation, whose date must be placed a considerable time before the year 2000 B.C., locates a holy tree, which at once reminds us of the tree in the Hebrew account of Paradise:

"In Nun-Ki (Eridu) there grew up a dark date-palm,
In a pure place it was created.
The [abode] of the god Ea is its meadow in Nun-Ki, profusion in plenty.
Its dwelling-place is the middle-point of the world.
Its leaves are the resting-couch of the mother, the goddess Ba'u.
. . . in its shining abode, which spreads shade like a wood, and into its recesses none may penetrate."

This is the sense of this interesting fragment in a literal translation (compare my "History of Babylonia and Assyria," pp. 197 f. and 398). In later days, when South Babylonia had exchanged its religious importance for one of more historical character, the Babylonians seem to have transferred

Paradise southward from the outlet of the rivers to the sea, and to have conceived of it as an island of the blessed. The solitary island of Socotra, which lies in the Indian Ocean, but not too remote from Arabia on the one side and the Somali-land of Africa on the other, and which Glaser has identified with the Iskuduru of the Achmænide inscriptions, played in the mythology of the Egyptians * a part similar to that of Paradise among the Hebrews, and the Isle of the Blessed in the Babylonian Epic of Gishdubar.† When we learn from the latter that Gishdubar comes first to the Mountain Mâshu (in Yemâma, according to Glaser) and then to the sea-coast, to journey thence (by a three days' voyage over a distance which otherwise would occupy six weeks) to the Waters of Death, until he finally reaches that Isle, the abode of the Babylonian Noah, it is very evident that precisely Socotra again is meant. But for the present it suffices to have shown that South Babylonia is the neighborhood in which in the earliest times the Babylonians (or the Sumerians), and after them the Hebrews, located Paradise.

University of Munich.

---

* Compare the old Egyptian tale, discovered by Golenisheff, of the king of the Incense-land, who resided in an enchanted island ; namely, Socotra,—and identification made by Golenisheff himself. It is published in the Transactions of the Berlin Congress of Orientalists, and reproduced in Erman's "Egypt" (p. 673 ff.). Compare also Eduard Glaser in *Ausland* for 1890, p. 524.

† NOTE.—This name is to be pronounced "Gilgamesh," according to a little fragment published by Theophilus G. Pinches.—THE EDITOR.

BUDDHISM AND LAMAISM IN MONGOLIA.

BY REV. JOHN SHEEPSHANKS.

From *The Newbery House Magazine* (London), December, 1891.

IT was on my way from China to Lake Baikal, in Siberia, where I much wished to visit the interesting missions of the Græco-Russian Church to the Bouriats, and to gain upon the spot some knowledge of Shamanism, the most ancient of the heathen religions upon earth, that I was led to visit Kuren (or Ourga, as the Russians call it), the sacred city of the Mongols.

It is their sacred city, as being the usual residence of their great Lama, the object of their deepest veneration, the centre of their religious worship. For the Buddhist religion, as it is still found in Hindostan or Ceylon, is in many ways unsuited to the simple children of the Steppes, who require a creed less mystic and less philosophical, more simple, more concrete, and appealing more directly to the religious element in their nature. And so, among the Mongols, Buddhism, which has ever exhibited such a wonderful power of adapting itself to the varying requirements of peoples, has taken an altogether different shape. Indeed, it is quite misleading to speak of Buddhism as it is found in Southern, Eastern, and Central Asia, as if it were everywhere but one and the same religion. The Fo-ism of China is mixed up with the other philosophic and moral theories and traditional customs of the Celestial Kingdom ; and the Lamaistic form of Buddhism which holds in Mongolia, and which has taken into its system and assimilated portions of the old Shamanism, and even, as I have witnessed, some elements of fire-worship, probably resembles in fact the Tao-ism of China, or even the Polytheism of ancient Greece or Rome, almost as much as the pure Buddhism of Ceylon.

The priesthood, as representative of the ascetic element, is everywhere highly exalted wherever the Buddhist religion has spread ; and in this fact there has been an opportunity for a development highly congenial to the religious instincts of the pastoral tribes of Central Asia. One of the sacred Triads specially reverenced among the Mongols is that of Burchan, Lama, and Nom—the "Buddha, Sanga, and Dharma" of more southern Buddhists ; *i.e.*, "the Divinity,* the Priesthood, and the Law." Indeed, there is probably not a more priest-ridden people upon the face of the earth. But though from the first preaching of Buddhism in Thibet and Mongolia the great Lamas at the head of the spiritual hierarchy have ever been regarded with the excessive reverence of superstition, it was not for many centuries, probably not until the close of the fifteenth century, that there sprung up the remarkable theory of a perpetual incarnation in them. Padma-pâni is perpetually incarnate in the successive Dalai-Lamas of Thibet ; and Pandida, who, it is said, first preached Buddhism in Thibet, is incarnate in the great Lama of Mongolia, or "Khutuktu."† Thus, then, there is a concrete object of religious veneration far better suited than the philosophic theories of Southern Asia to the simple ignorant peasants of the Steppes. It is true, indeed, that they profess to believe in "gods many, and lords many." Invading Buddhism took into itself, as I have said, a large portion of the former belief in demonology; and having been originally, according to the teaching of Shakyamúni, probably purely atheistic, has become in Mongolia, Thibet, and China, actually polytheistic. You cannot enter a Buddhist temple in Mongolia without seeing images of divinities in the shrines, and banners with hideous delineations of demon-gods hanging down on all sides from the roof. Yet I fancy the belief in these gods has comparatively but a slight hold upon the people. Their enthusiastic loyalty, their most reverent worship, the deepest devotion of their hearts are reserved for the Lama, the man like themselves, whom, with no reason indeed that can be estimated, they fondly believe, or suppose, to be an incarnate god.

---

* The Mongolian word "Burchan" is not to be regarded as the exact equivalent of "Buddha." The missionaries of Buddhism found the word upon their entrance into Mongolia. It is an old Shaman word, and the Siberian Shamans of the present day call the divinity "Burchan." It is used by the Christian Bouriats for the true God, and is employed by the Christian missionaries in the same sense.

† The Khutuktu is of the supposed incarnations the third in rank ; the two others that rank above him being the Dalai-Lama and the Bantcheyne Bogdo, both of Thibet. Which of these two last mentioned is the superior in dignity seems to be a moot point ; at least, in Mongolia precedence is sometimes attributed to one, sometimes to the other.

The Khutuktu is from the early days of his childhood immured in the enclosure of his palace at Kuren. This he never quits, except when he pays a visit to his house in the country, and on the solemn occasions when he comes forth in state to bless and be adored by the people. If he pass safely through childhood and attain to the state of manhood, he is then, at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, taken away to Thibet to be consecrated to the rank of "Geloon" by the Dalai-Lama,[*] and usually dies on his journey home, or if not, then soon after his return to Mongolia. The explanation of this at first sight startling fact could beyond doubt be furnished by the agents of "Bogdo Khan,"[†] who has an hereditary fear of the warlike Mongols, and jealousy of their chief, and well understands the secret art, fighting with "silver spears," of striking down an enemy at a distance. No need to say that the unhappy man himself is kept in absolute ignorance of the fate which has overtaken his predecessors and awaits himself. When he is dead, it is believed that the divinity which dwelt in him has passed into some other child of man recently born, and a grand deputation of Lamas is at once despatched to Thibet to institute a search for the child; for it is the will of Bogdo Khan that the Khutuktu should be of Thibetan parentage. M. Huc tells us in his "Travels in Tartary"—a book which I may remark by the way is not always to be relied on for perfect accuracy—how he himself witnessed this cavalcade on its way to Thibet. The head Lamas are of course alone aware of the secret signs by which the infant who has inherited the divinity may be recognized, and accordingly they find them in the infant son of suitable and compliant parents. The little one is duly adored, and taken charge of, and carried off to his luxurious captivity at Kuren. Sometimes, when passing by the enclosure and seeing the gaudily coloured and gilt roofs of his pavilions rising above the lofty wooden walls, one thought sadly of the young man within, and longed to be able to whisper a few words in his ear and warn him of the fate in store for him.

It has always been the policy of the astute Government of China, while abstaining from interference with the spiritual authority of the great Lama, to curtail and keep in check his temporal power. The country of the Khalkas, which lies to the north of the great desert "Gobi"—a tract of 300,000 square miles, the more desolate part of which is called "Shamo," the "Sea of Sand"—is divided into four khanates; and there is, besides, the "Shabin" Government, consisting of clans given to the Khutuktu at various times by different princes. The men of the Shabin, assigned to the temples, numbered a few years ago upwards of 70,000. The administration was formerly in the hands of the Khutuktu himself, but has recently been taken from him by the Chinese Government and entrusted to a Lama, a nominee of its own, who with his two assistants resides at Kuren. But all the ecclesiastical affairs of Shabin are administered in the name of the Khutuktu.

The four khanates of Khalka, containing, it is said, a population of 5,000,000, form two Governments, each presided over by an Umban, or Governor, appointed from China, to which Khalka became subject towards the close of the seventeenth century. The Umban of Kuren, the easternmost of these two Governments, was at the time of my visit not a Chinaman, but a Mongol, a Buddhist of the most rigid type. At the time of his appointment he was greatly scandalised at the atmosphere of the world which surrounds the sacred city. There is an old Buddhist law that no merely secular persons, such as traders or shopkeepers, should dwell within two miles of the residence of the Khutuktu; whereas, the law having fallen into desuetude, a town of considerable size has sprung up around the lamaseries. In fact, while the number of Lamas in Kuren is between 3,000 and 4,000, the total number of inhabitants is said to be 10,000. The newly appointed governor determined to sweep all these people away from the place ; a hazardous and most impolitic act. But the Khutuktu, showing himself to be in this a sensible man, has for the present put a stop to the execution of the threat. He told the governor that he was too late ; matters had gone too far ; and the attempt to drive away some 7,000 people from their shops and houses would be folly. Besides, the presence of the people had as yet in no way injured him or the interest of the religion. And so the matter rests.

---

[*] There are three orders peculiar to the Mongolian "Lama": (i.) Geloon, (ii.) Getzoul, and (iii.) Houvarak.

[†] "Bogdo" means "Divine." Bogdo Khan is the Emperor of China. "Tzagan Khan"—"agan," white, or happy—is the Czar of Russia.

At the present time the chief part of the secular population resides in an eastern suburb, separated from the sacred city by a broad street or market-place. No woman is allowed to lodge in the sacred city.

The town is singularly built, being formed of a large number of enclosures, varying in size, and all surrounded with high wooden palisades. These wooden walls vary from eight to ten or twelve feet in height ; so that, the houses being very low, those of the Chinamen being only of one story—nothing of them can be seen from outside, except, perhaps, just the ridges of the Chinese houses. As these enclosures adjoin one another, they form streets, or, rather, unpaved roads, often very muddy, and are entered through a gate, roughly and squarely made. When you enter one of these enclosures you will find one or two Mongol huts, or a low Chinese house, built in what we call the pavilion style, or perhaps an idol temple. The Mongolian huts, or "gurrs," are bee-hive-looking structures, in form very much like the pictures that one often sees of the tents of the Esquimaux. In shape they are circular, with a wall about five feet in height, and conical roof. The framework is made of sticks of wood, placed lattice-wise, imported from China or Siberia—for there are no trees upon the Steppes—and is covered with felt kept down by cords. There is no chimney, but a circular hole at the apex of the roof, to allow the smoke from the argol (dung) fire to escape. The temples are made of wood, and in their ground-plan bear a resemblance, perhaps merely superficial, to the construction of the Greek churches. In the porch there are one or two large prayer cylinders, perhaps five or six feet in height. In the drums of these there are fixed spokes of wood, to which every one gives a push as he goes in or out ; so that they are usually found slowly revolving. The main body of the building, the hall of assembly, or "nave" as we should term it, is rectangular, usually square in shape, festooned with cloths, and banners hanging from the roof, upon which are depicted the effigies of the Buddhas and Demons. Drums also are suspended from the roof, which are beaten from time to time. At the opposite side of the hall of assembly from the porch is the shrine ; or very commonly this is in a separate apartment, connected with the hall by a short passage. Here, perhaps in a case, are the images of the gods, and upon an altar-table little brass cups filled with offerings—wheat, millet, rice, and butter. In the large hall, or "nave," the visitor will probably at any time find three or four Lamas of the poorer sort, with their shaven heads and loose, dirty garments, sitting cross legged on the floor, having their books of prayers, shaped like long, old fashioned music-books,* before them on a low desk, growling, or rather bellowing, out the sacred formulas in their hoarsest bass, as though they would be "heard for their much speaking."

These Lamas, who form such a large part, it is said more than a moiety, of the male population, are the least prepossessing people that one meets with in Mongolia. They are lazy, inquisitive of course like all the other Mongols, very dirty, and frequently supercilious and domineering. In appearance they differ only from the laity in having the head entirely shaved ; whereas the layman, though having his head partially shaved, wears a short pigtail from the crown. Their recitation of the prayers (so-called), which are written in Thibetan, the sacred language, of which many of them do not understand a word, is utterly formal, and, if there be no witnesses present, often unreal and irreverent to the last degree. They will frequently break off their recitations to chatter and laugh, and sometimes shout out mere gibberish, "vain repetitions" indeed.

Being on one occasion alone in one of these temples along with a single Lama, who was as usual pretending to growl out his prayers, I listened attentively, and found that he was in fact saying nothing but "Hum, hum, hum, ha, ha, ha ;" and upon my approaching him, and asking him the names of the various divinities depicted on the banners, he talked and laughed aloud, and felt my garments, and wanted to know their price, and all about them.

Externally the great hall of the temple is roofed over with a large dome, made of a framework of wood covered with canvas; so that at a little distance these temples appear not unlike large tents, such as are sometimes used in country places in England for the performances of a circus.

---

* The books of magic mentioned in Acts xix. 19 were probably books of sacred formulæ such as these.

In this strange city the most singular feature to the eye of the stranger is perhaps that presented by the mechanical contrivances for prayer. Over the gate of each of the enclosures, between the cross-pieces, there is fixed a good-sized prayer wheel, to the drum or cylinder of which two or three small sails are attached, similar to those that are fastened to the children's toy windmills in England. These are caught by every passing breeze; so that, especially when a strong wind prevails, the rapidly revolving cylinders cause a perpetual whirr throughout the place. There are also numerous poles erected here and there, with streamers, upon which the sacred formulas are written; and as the wheels revolve, and the streamers flutter in the breeze, continual prayers and aspirations are supposed to be ascending to the Buddha world. I was very wishful to obtain one of these prayer-cylinders, but for a considerable time was baffled in my object, as it is strictly forbidden to the Lamas to sell them. However, on one occasion, finding near one of the temples a receptacle for the worn-out paraphernalia, and grubbing about to see what I could discover, I fished up, along with old banners and pictures of the Buddhas and Demons, some of which I still possess, an old broken prayer-wheel. An inquisitive young Lama coming up at the moment, I told him, in answer to his questionings, that I wanted a prayer-wheel, and would give him a good sum for one. Looking round cautiously to see that no one was within earshot, he promised that he would try to get one, and bring it to me at the Russian station where I was staying, at a little distance from the town. Accordingly, the next night, long after dark, having muffled himself up to avoid recognition, he brought in one of the common hand prayer-wheels, which is before me as I write. It is thirteen inches in length, and consists of three parts: a wooden handle or stick, terminating in a long iron spike; the cylinder, made of copper, four inches in diameter, perforated with a hole through which the spike is passed, and a brass knob which secures it there. From the external face of the cylinder there hangs a heavy knob of copper by a string, which, when a rotatory movement is given by means of the handle, causes it to revolve more readily. Within the cylinder there is, I know, though I have never opened mine, a long, narrow coil of paper, upon which prayers are inscribed in Thibetan characters, probably the famous formula said to have been given by Abida to Ariabolo, that therewith he might assuage the vices and passions of men: "Om Mani-padme Um"—"Glory to Padma-páni." This, perhaps, will be inscribed very many times upon the scroll. There is a correct way of holding the prayer-wheel. The thumb should not be extended up the stick, but tucked in under the fingers, and it is usually revolved from left to right. The vulgar idea is, I suppose, that the use of the prayer-wheel is merely that of indolently saving the trouble of saying the prayers, but this is a mistake. The magical formula is usually repeated aloud while the wheel is being revolved, and sometimes, by means of a rosary held in the left hand, the revolutions are duly recorded. On one occasion, when crossing Shamo, a poor Mongol woman asked permission to accompany my caravan through a part of the night. For four hours I walked behind her, beside the ungainly camels, over the soft, silent sand, with the starlit sky above, and the desert stretching away on either side into the obscurity, and all the while she spun her prayer-wheel, and chanted to a monotonous tune, in her soft woman's voice, the "Om Mani-padme Um." Never for a moment the wheel was still. Occasionally she would speak to my two Mongols, or make replies to them; but, excepting during these breaks, she never once ceased her chant—"Om Mani-padme Um." The esoteric idea is that, as at each revolution of the cylinder this formula is shown to each point of the compass, to the four corners of the earth there is exhibited the glory of Padma-páni, the heavenly lotus-bearer.

I was hugely delighted during my stay at Kuren to hear that the great Lama, being about to remove to his country-house, would come forth to be adored by and to bless his devoted people. When the appointed day arrived, having driven into Kuren, accompanied by a young Russian, I made my way to the palace of the Khutuktu. On our arrival before the gate, at about half-past ten A.M., we found that the ceremony was not expected to take place till nearly noon. We found plenty of amusement, however, during the interval, in looking upon the scene around us. There were brown, dirty, ruddy Mongols from the country, come on pilgrimage; and country-women, rich and poor, the former decked out in all their bizarre finery. In the midst of the throng there was a spare, ascetic-looking Manchurian Lama, who attracted much attention, sitting cross-legged on the ground, clothed in red, with a yellow hat much like that of a mediæval jester, revolving his cylinder with his rosary in his left hand, chanting out his monotonous prayers. Costumes of many patterns and various colours and fabrics; silks of blue and red; rough, simple shepherds in sheep-skin frocks, oddly-shaped hats, and heavy felt boots; Lamas in red flowing garments and wonderful yellow hats of different shapes—round, helmeted, and crested: such were some of the objects that struck the eye.

Taking out my note-book, I made a few sketches of some of the strangest figures; but this I had to do very cautiously, as some of them, especially the women, evidently resented what they regarded as a liberty. At length there was a stir among the people, which showed that the eagerly-expected ceremony was about to take place; and they all moved off to an open space in front of an enclosure near the palace. After a little while the gates of this enclosure were thrown open, and a small decorated pavilion was discovered inside, with a highly ornate chair, in which the great one was to sit. The pilgrims were all arranged in three or four broad rows across the open space, and sat down thickly upon the ground. We walked off to the gate of the palace enclosure, from which, we were told, the Khutuktu would soon issue. Presently a small procession of Lamas arrived, and took up their position at the same spot.* There were two men having long strips of fur, which they wore somewhat as the Eastern deacons wear their stoles, over the right shoulder, and hanging down towards the ground. There were two men in huge yellow woollen helmets, bearing trumpets shaped like flageolets; and a number of Lamas, advanced in life and of high position, in large gilt processional hats. One Lama bore a lofty round canopy of yellow silk, like a large umbrella with long hangings. Other Lamas of high degree bore a sedan-chair covered with yellow stuff. Shortly after this procession had taken its place the trumpets were sounded, and all eyes were turned towards the gate, which, up to this time, had been shut. It opened, and there came out a group of high Lamas, all in bright red flowing silk robes, and among them the god himself, who immediately took his seat upon the sedan-chair and was lifted up by the Lamas appointed for the purpose. He was a stout man, with a large, round, shaven, good-humoured face, not wanting in intelligence, but with a smirking and consequential expression. I should have guessed him to be about thirty years of age, but in fact he was only twenty-one; the time, therefore, of his fateful journey to Thibet was not far off. The trumpets continued blowing, the procession started, and soon entered the enclosure that I have mentioned. To the gate of this we hurried in time to see the great Lama take his seat upon the chair of state. All caps were taken off, the Khutuktu alone remaining covered, and a chosen few were ranged before him. These were they who obtained the privilege by valuable gifts. The presents of rich Mongols are, I was told, often very costly. I saw one man, only meanly dressed, carrying in a silver plate, shaped like a crown and elaborately carved, as his offering. These favoured ones were placed before the great one, and all, both men and women, took off their hats, which were held by the attendant Lamas, and received the much-valued benediction, the while prayers were chanted out in the deep bass which the Lamas cultivate, and handfuls of corn were thrown up into the air. We were standing at the gate during this ceremony, not being allowed to enter. While there, the Umban and other mandarins, clad in rich garments of blue silk, their hats adorned with buttons that denoted their rank, and peacocks feathers—a decoration conferred by Bogdo Khan—passed in and took up their positions not far from the throne. But they were evidently quite subordinate personages. When the favoured ones had received their special blessing, the trumpets were again sounded, we were requested to move away from the gate, and the great one came forth. First stalked the two Lamas with their so-called stoles of fur; next the two trumpeters in their helmets; then one or two Lamas; then one bearing a censer; then the sedan-chair with the god lifted on high on the shoulders of the Lamas. A few more Lamas and the Mandarins closed the procession which moved, not quickly, but not very slowly, down the ranks of people kneeling or prostrating themselves upon the ground. Each person, man and woman, had a small silk handkerchief, which he or she had brought as an offering, for they were all quite poor people. These were collected by the attendant Lamas. The great one held a long strand or rein of silk in each hand, which he twisted round as he was borne along.

---

* There are no less than 500 Lamas in the personal retinue of the Khutuktu.

Each strand was tied to the handle of a wand borne by a Lama walking on either side. To the other end of this wand there was attached a small bunch of silk ribands, and with this, as the procession moved onwards, the Lamas touched rapidly the bare heads of the people, they at the time, poor things, holding up their hands with the palms pressed together as if in prayer, and with a rapt, awe-struck expression upon their simple faces. Thus, through the medium of the wand and the silk strand, each person was for a brief moment brought *en rapport* with the incarnate god. He in the meantime looked round with much indifference and complacency. As he passed near me and my companion, he looked at us, as we stood, with some displeasure, and prudence whispered that it might be safer to kneel, or at least incline one's head ; but the prudence of my reflections was counteracted by the British obstinacy of my knees ; I felt that it could not be done ; and doubtless recognising that we were not of his people, the Lama's expression quickly changed to a stare of eager curiosity, and I, for my part, returned his gaze with some curiosity and yet more sadness. Thus the ranks were all passed through, the trumpets blowing lustily all the while, and the great one, returning by the way he came, the walls of the enclosure once more hid him from our view.

The people then slowly dispersed ; many of them, however, stopping awhile to worship. Standing before the gates of the palace, and placing the palms of their hands together, they touched their foreheads and breasts, and then, prostrating themselves at full length upon their faces, they touched the earth with their foreheads. This they would do, perhaps a few, perhaps many times ; and then, brushing the dust from their heads, went away to their place of lodging.

It was all very strange and piteous. The words arose to one's mind which long, long ago spake of the unhappiness of those "who worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed for evermore. Amen."

THE KENDRICK JUBILEE.

From *The Central Christian Advocate* (Meth. Epis.), St. Louis, Dec. 9, 1891.

THE rare privilege of celebrating the jubilee of a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church was offered to the friends of Archbishop Kendrick, of St. Louis, on the thirtieth of last month, and they determined to make the most of it. For some months preparations were making to produce the most impressive exhibition of ecclesiastical pomp ever seen in this country. The dignitaries of the Church, of which the Archbishop has been so long an honored member, responded to the invitation from every portion of the United States, and beyond. Cardinal Gibbons, a prince of the Church, archbishops and bishops by the score, and priests by the fifties graced the occasion. There was, we may say without fear of contradiction, singular appropriateness in this generous manifestation of honor and affection for the venerable Archbishop. He was worthy of it all. For fifty years his service as the highest official of his Church in the Mississippi Valley has drawn upon him the eyes of many people, and the testimony is universal to his pure life, his charitable impulses, his loving genial fellowship, his scholarly attainments, his wise administration of the trust confided to him. Even those who have least sympathy for the Church that he represented freely express their admiration of the man. And he had other qualities which produced respect. His manly stand against the foolish willfulness of Pope Pius IX. in forcing upon the Roman Catholic Church the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, although he at last accepted the finding of the Council, increased respect for his sterling qualities. This independence and his humility during the years when on account of his courage he was suspended from the duties of his office will add lustre to his name in the days to come.

But Archbishop Kendrick is not the product of Romanism, but of that living principle of Christianity which works out its effect in all Christian Churches. It is this which has made him what he is, and gained him the regard of Christians of other denominations. And while the ceremonies lacked nothing that could be devised to impress the people with the commanding position and influence of the Church of Rome, they were not distinctively Christian. It was impossible to conceal the incongruity of the display with our American life and convictions. It was the pageant of a departed period, out of harmony with the present time and the place where it was acted, a feeble imitation of monarchical institutions and feeling. The ecclesiastical procession would have lost its imposing proportions had the foreign-born prelates and priests been excluded.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (The International Theological Library.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891. 8vo, pp. xxxii, 522, $2.50.

This is the first volume of the International Theological Library, a series to be edited by Professor Briggs in this country and Professor Salmond in Great Britain. The theological point of view of the editors is well known, and will probably be reflected in the series. Of Professor Driver's competency, his judgment, and his fairness it would be superfluous to speak. The volume before us is by a thorough scholar.

The established science of Old Testament introduction is generally divided into two parts—general introduction and introduction to the several books. It is the latter which is treated here, as indicated by the title, "Introduction to the *Literature* of the Old Testament." The subject of the canon is treated only in a brief introductory chapter, and the Old Testament text, versions and editions are ignored altogether. The unity of the book manifestly gains by this limitation. It becomes a treatise on the character and origin of the books of the Old Testament. The first chapter, on the origin of these books *according to the Jews*, shows us that we have no trustworthy external evidence on this point. The consequence is that we are shut up to the internal evidence—*i.e.*, to the method of literary criticism. A further consequence is that not all questions can be settled with equal definiteness. Like all other historical researches, these can yield not mathematical certainty, but a probability of greater or less degree. "It has been no part of my object" says the preface "to represent conclusions as more certain than is authorized by the facts upon which they depend." The general self-restraint of the critics on this point has sometimes been misunderstood, and the complaint has been made that the higher criticism is a congeries of uncertainties; but this is no more true of the historical study of the Old Testament than of historical study in general.

Professor Driver takes up the books of the Old Testament in the order of the Hebrew Canon. He gives a summary of the contents of each. He then notices the literary structure and the marks of style. In conclusion he gives the date, so far as it can be established, or, if uncertain, the limits within which the book must be placed. His conclusions generally agree with those of other scholars who acknowledge the right of literary criticism. The test case is the age of the Priest Code. Dr. Driver says:

"These arguments [a comparison with J E, D, and Ezekiel] combine to make it probable that the *completed* Priests' Code is the work of the age subsequent to Ezekiel. When, however, this is said, it is very far from being implied that all the institutions of P are the *creation* of this age. . . . The Priests' Code embodies some elements with which the earlier literature is in harmony, and which indeed it presupposes; it embodies other elements with which the same literature is in conflict, and the existence of which it even seems to preclude. This double aspect of the Priests' Code is reconciled by the supposition that the chief ceremonial institutions of Israel are *in their origin* of great antiquity; but that the laws respecting them were gradually developed and elaborated, and *in the shape in which they are formulated in the Priests' Code* that they belong to the exilic or early post-exilic period. In its main stock the legislation of P was thus not (as the critical view of it is sometimes represented by its opponents as teaching) 'manufactured' by the priests during the exile; it is based upon *pre-existing Temple usage*, and exhibits the form which that finally assumed" (p. 135).

For those who like to label everybody with a party name this passage will place Professor Driver among the "moderate Wellhausenians."

As an example of our author's discriminating literary feeling, we may quote his criticism of the Yahvist (J):

"J, if he dwells less than E upon concrete particulars, excels in the power of delineating life and character. His touch is singularly light; with a few strokes he paints a scene which before he has finished is impressed indelibly upon his readers' memory. In ease and grace his narratives are unsurpassed; everything is told with precisely the amount of detail that is required; the narrative never lingers and the reader's interest is sustained to the end. His dialogues especially (which are frequent) are remarkable for the delicacy and truthfulness with which character and emotions find expression in them; who can ever forget the pathos and supreme beauty of Judah's intercession (Gen. xliv. 18ff.)? . . . The character of Moses is portrayed by him with singular attractiveness and force. In J, further, the prophetical element is conspicuously prominent. Indeed, his characteristic features may be said to be the fine vein of ethical and theological reflection which pervades his work throughout, and the manner in which his narrative, even more than that of E, becomes the vehicle of religious teaching" (pp. 112, 113).

Compare the similar description of Jeremiah, too long to quote here (p. 256).

The author's polemic is entirely free from heat of temper and from expressions of prejudice. Frequently he points out in a single sentence the weakness of the opposite view, as where he says: "Though it may appear paradoxical to say so, Deuteronomy *does not claim to be written by Moses;* whenever the author speaks himself he purports to give a description in the third person of what he did or said" (p. 83). So of a well-known book: "There are many just observations on the theological truths which find expression in the Mosaic law; but it is an *ignoratio elenchi* to suppose them to be a refutation of the opinion that Hebrew legislation reached its final form by successive stages, except upon the assumption that all progress must proceed from purely natural causes—an assumption both unfounded in itself and opposed to the general sense of theologians, who speak, for instance, habitually of a progressive revelation" (p. 149). That the author is in sympathy with the theological content of the Old Testament is frequently shown, and he nowhere shows a leaning toward the naturalistic rationalism so often charged upon biblical critics. So where he says Professor Bissell "has not shown that the critical view . . . cannot be stated in a form free from exaggeration, and entirely compatible with the reality of the supernatural enlightenment vouchsafed to the ancient people of God" (p. 150). In regard to the second part of Isaiah, while maintaining its exilic date, he expressly refuses to reduce it to a *vaticinium ex* *eventu*, asserting that its whole tone "shows that it is written *prior* to the events which it declares to be approaching."

Some interest has been shown lately in the Bampton lectures of Professor Cheyne, in which he expresses doubt as to the Davidic authorship of most of the Psalms. It will be interesting to note that Professor Driver's position is similar. After giving Ewald's list of supposed Davidic Psalms (twelve in number besides some fragments), he says these Psalms "are marked by a freshness and poetic force and feeling and a certain brightness of language and expression which distinguish them from most of the others attributed to David; and if Davidic Psalms are preserved in the Psalter, we may safely say that they are to be found among those which Ewald has selected." He then points out the indications in these very Psalms against the theory, ending up with a *non liquet*. It is pretty clear to the present reviewer that this is as near as we can come to a definite utterance on this subject. What is hard to see is the reason for the resentment with which this conclusion is received. Is not the twenty-third Psalm just as sweet and helpful, if written by some other humble shepherd, as if written by the one who afterward became King of Israel?

Several features of this work will make it especially helpful to students. Among these I reckon the little chronological tables at the beginning of several chapters, as the chapter on Isaiah; further, the good bibliography, including, so far as I have noticed, all the works of present importance. Especially thorough are the lists of Hebrew words or phrases characteristic of the different writers; no less than forty are enumerated for Deuteronomy and fifty for the Priest Code. These tables deserve serious study by any one who would weigh the evidence for the critical theory of the Pentateuch. Similar attention should be given to the synopsis of laws in Deuteronomy with their parallels in the other documents.

I have said enough to show that the book is one worthy of its subject, thorough in its treatment, reverent in its tone, sympathetic in its estimate, frank in its recognition of difficulties, conservative (in the best sense of the word) in its statements of results. Such a book can be refuted only upon its own ground. Its strong array of facts must be reckoned with. For this reason all interested in the foundations of Christian theology should give it careful and unprejudiced study.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.
LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE GREAT DISCOURSE OF JESUS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD. A Topical Arrangement and Analysis of all His Words Recorded in the New Testament separated from the Context. New York: Randolph [1891]. Pp. xxxi., 361, $1.50.

The title of this volume describes the contents almost as fully as can be wished. The body of the work is preceded by an "Apologia," signed C. W. L., which gives an account of the mental and spiritual condition of the writer and of the means by which he was brought into the fulness of the light of Gospel truth. That condition was one of antagonism to the Church and its offices, an ill-defined but powerful aversion to its methods and its claims. In this the writer is undoubtedly a type of many others, who have similar feelings and similar antipathies which are perhaps incapable of exact expression or definition, but which are possessed of a terrible power of alienating those who have been born and bred under the shadow of the sanctuary, determining them away from the Church of their birth and equally from all others. Such persons are unwilling perhaps to see that this alienation and separation is the result of ignorance of the true essence of that which they suppose that they hate. Like the writer, they have been turned away by certain vague aversions to the externals of the historical representations of the Christ, and because they have not learned what is the true inwardness, the vast scope, the exhaustless fulness of the truth, both spiritual and moral, which is contained in those words of spirit and life of Him who spake as never man spake.

This book records the spiritual birth of one who found spirit and life in the teachings of the Master, after having separated them from the externals of the story in which they were wrapped up. The discovery of the depth of meaning in the words ". . . the things of the Spirit of God . . . are spiritually discerned," gave a new turn to the author's mind and changed utterly his mental view-point. Then the things which before had stood in his way and barred his approach suddenly became of minor importance, and the impossibility of gauging spiritual truth by the old criteria made former objections sink into insignificance and nothingness. A new start must be made and new standards of criticism set up. But here, as is probably true in a far greater number of cases than is realized by the preacher or by the persons themselves, the great difficulty was that there was a vast amount of ignorance of what those spiritual teachings really are. In order to gain the knowledge that had become essential, the author made for himself the collections of sayings which are here presented to us in printed form. It was a novel and yet simple thought to separate the words from their context. At first thought one might say that thereby violence would be done to the truth. But we do not believe that such an impression will be left on any mind after a perusal of the words as here presented. Familiar as we are with the narratives in which the words occur, we seem to miss the setting, but as we read we find that the discourses fit into one another in a marvellous way, and we discover a fulness of truth which, possibly, we had never before realized.

The author's purpose in printing the volume was that that might be the means of helping others which he had found so helpful and beneficial in his own case. It is evident from the arrangement and choice of the rubrics under which the various sayings have been analyzed that the writer is not a theologian, but one whose aim has been to reflect the truth which he had found with as little as possible of the personal equation and with no dogmatic or ecclesiastical bias. On this very account the volume is the better adapted to meet the wants and actual needs of others, though it may be thereby open to the criticism of the scientific theologian. But the essential thing, after all, is the truth itself, and not the mould in which it is cast. The main thing is that we have the words which are able to give instruction and whose entrance giveth light placed before us in forms which have already approved themselves by the test of actual trial.

But there is another aspect in which the book may be regarded. It is calculated to aid those who are in accord, more or less complete and hearty, with the Church as well as those who are out of accord with all ecclesiastical arrangements, methods, and claims. But, furthermore, it is calculated to open the eyes of ministers to some of the secret springs of the antipathies and aversions of those who should be their hearers, but who are not. Ministers too often live in little worlds of their own, without a knowledge of the actual thoughts, feelings, and reflections of those who are just outside of their flocks. It will be a happy day for the Church when the ministers shall become so well acquainted with the actual and precise difficulties which keep really conscientious men outside of the Church that they shall be able to take such by the hand and lead them into the truth which maketh free indeed.

Charles R. Gillett.

New York.

The Spirit of Man. An Essay in Christian Philosophy. By Arthur Chandler, M.A., Fellow and late Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891. Pp. xii., 227, $1.75.

This essay is an attempt to show the deep significance of Christianity for fundamental, speculative, and practical problems. In Chapter I. knowledge and reality are treated. The theories of their relation are briefly but keenly discussed, and the conclusion is reached that they are but opposite sides of truth. Chapter II. treats of the nature of man and the work of Christ. Here abstract spiritualism is condemned, and both body and spirit are looked upon as partners in a single spiritual personality. In the Fall both partners suffered; and body and spirit alike fell into degradation. The work of Christ was to remedy this disaster, and restore both body and spirit so that our true spiritual personality might be regained. A true life is thus restored to the race by and in Christ. This life is described as eternal, in the sense of being absolute or complete. The chaos and disruption of fallen human nature are removed and this is life eternal; but this life is obtained only through communion with Christ (*a*) in the eucharist and (*b*) in the life of trust and obedience. Thus spiritual life becomes sacramental; and all work, if unselfishly performed, may acquire a spiritual character and become the vehicle of the eternal life. Freedom, virtue, and institutions are treated in separate chapters, and the significance of Christianity for them is shown. Real freedom, in distinction from formal freedom, is found only in that gracious renewal of the soul, whereby we are "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." In treating of virtue, the claim is made that only in Christianity do we have a motive and an aim strong enough and great enough to give ethics any sufficient foundation. In this respect it is contrasted with Greek ethics and with utilitarianism. Institutions are shown to be necessary instruments for the perfection of individual character, by furnishing the conditions of unselfish living. Of these institutions the Church is the greatest. For those who can read it, this work will be found very suggestive and stimulating. Even where one might doubt the cogency of the argument, he would find real thought and not merely forms of words.

Borden P. Bowne.

Boston University.

Brief Reviews, by the Editor.

The Book of Ecclesiastes. With a new translation, by *Samuel Cox* (8vo, pp. xvi., 335) and *The Book of Proverbs*, by *R. F. Horton* (pp viii., 418), are two volumes of the Expositor's Bible series which appeared during the past year. (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, $1.50.) Unfortunately an earlier notice of these two excellent volumes has seemed impossible. and even now space forbids extended review. Several of the series have been noticed, and almost invariably with words of warm commendation.—The former volume is a rewriting of the author's book, "The Quest of the Chief Good," published in 1867. It contains an excellent translation of the original in a shape to correspond with the forms of Hebrew poetry. It is divided into parts and sections corresponding to the mode of thought, showing progress and a final aim. The "chief good" is thus set forth by the writer in the "large, noble conclusion, that only as men reverence God, and keep His commandments, and trust in His love, do they touch their true ideal, and find a good that will satisfy and sustain them under all changes, even to the last." The volume contains an inspiring study of a portion of Scripture, which, from its supposed pessimism, is only too often ignored and disregarded.—Mr. Horton's volume is made on an entirely different plan. In order to give a greater coherence to the parts, thirty-one topics have been chosen which are suggested by maxims found in Proverbs. These are treated by way of exposition, and with a width of illustration and an aptness of application which make the lessons clear and available for immediate use. We seem to have before us a series of expository discourses which may well serve to teach the learner how the lecture of this sort should be constructed. We have presented to us some samples of what may be done, not an exhaustion of all that can be done. Both these volumes are valuable additions not only to the series to which they belong, but also to the literature which serves to assist the preacher in the study of the Word, in order that he may present it in profitable form to those to whom he is set to minister.

How to Mark Your Bible, by Mrs. *Stephen Menzies*. Prefatory note by *D. L. Moody*. (New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., no date, 16mo, pp. 175, 75 cents.) This book, by precept and example, will tell him who wishes to "mark" his Bible how to do it. The obvious objection that such usage mars the book, is discounted in advance. Certainly the specimen pages of a "marked" Bible, which are here presented, are not beautiful nor attractive; but the most serious objection is that a system like that indicated, leads one to grasp at certain resemblances or identities of words, and to lay stress upon them when torn out of their connection and context. They show truth in a one-sided manner. At the same time it is possible to see that a study of the Bible must be close and careful to enable one to do one's own marking. To construct a table of marginal references is a task of no small magnitude, and not to be performed in a day or a week. Most of this volume is taken up with the indications of markings and references, in which one may follow the writer's lead, but it were better to do the whole *de novo*, in order to get most good from the exercise.

The Fourfold Story: A Study of the Gospels, by *George F. Genung*. (Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 12mo, pp. 118, 75 cents.) This little book does not propose to give a life of Christ after the usual fashion, based upon a harmony of the Gospels, but rather an account of the contributions of each evangelist to that story. In this it follows, in some degree, the principles and methods of biblical theology. The author aims here to act as guide to the reader and to assist in the ascertainment of the truth. The reputation of the author as an inspiring teacher is well borne out by his present work. He says, "We will pass through the Gospel territory together." It has been said that he who learns *how* to study studies better than he who only amasses facts. Professor Genung aims to train his students to think for themselves and to rely upon themselves—true education—and in this book he has worked with a similar aim. Though the volume is not large, nor its contents detailed, it is calculated to render a service in just the line which the writer intended.

Saint Matthew's Witness to Words and Works of the Lord, or Our Saviour's Life as revealed in the Gospel of His earliest Evangelist, by *Francis W. Upham*, LL.D. (New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891, 12mo, pp. vii., 415, $1.20.) This is far from being a "Life of Christ" in the ordinary sense. It is rather an exposition of prominent or significant incidents without any considerable thread of narrative to bind the chapters into an organic whole. The author defines criticism not as "fault-finding," but as the process which should have *appreciation* as its goal. He holds that tradition is correct in ascribing a Hebrew gospel to Matthew, and supposes that the present Gospel was put into its Greek form by the original author. He asserts that without the miraculous work related in the narrative, the picture of the Christ would be "colorless." We have found the reading of the book difficult: the style is labored, the sentences are frequently involved, and the sense is often far from clear.

A book of antiquarian and historical interest, yet written in a popular and pleasing style, has recently appeared under the title *The Sabbath in Puritan New England*, by *Alice Morse Earle*. (New York: Scribners, 1891, 12mo, pp. viii., 335, $1.25.) It covers not only the Sabbath and its observances, but also the place of worship, the officers, the worshippers, the Psalm-books, and many other of the things which went to make up the completeness of the New England Puritan Lord's Day. The minister, the deacon, the tithingman—all are brought before us in speaking likeness to the original. The entire story is so well told, and the whole is so enlivened by incident and anecdote, that one is loath to lay the volume down. Doubtless its value might have been augmented for a few, if the authorities for some of the incidents and quotations had been given, but the evident intent has been to make a readable and popular book, and in this the author has succeeded admirably. An excellent index is affixed.

Two new volumes of the "Men of the Bible" series (New York: Randolph & Co) have recently appeared—viz., *Gideon and the Judges: A Study, Historical and Practical*, by Rev. *John Marshall Lang*, D.D., Minister of the Barony Parish, Glasgow (12mo, pp. xii., 201, $1), and *Ezra and Nehemiah: their Lives and Times*, by *George Rawlinson*, F.R.G.S., late Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford (12mo, pp. x., 182, $1). Each of these writers has produced a book in which he has clung with a considerable degree of tenacity to the order and detail of the biblical narrative. Criticism, which often has such a tendency to eliminate a considerable portion of the minutiæ from the story, has had little of that effect in either of these works. Dr. Lang has had the purpose of presenting the facts not only from the historical point of view, but with a homiletical intent as well. He has avoided the "dry-as-dust" in his narrative, and has aimed to give the impression of men who lived and felt as much like men of to-day as their environment permitted. The book is mainly biographical, incidentally giving us portrayals of the state of the land and people. Perhaps the most fundamental question conditioning the plan of presentation is connected with the critical attitude of the author in reference to the date of the book. Briefly stated, it is that the internal evidence points to the first six years of the reign of David, previous to the time when the Jebusites were overcome and Jerusalem captured by that king. Other indications would place the date after the inauguration of the kingdom. The statement of xviii. 30, on the other hand, makes the time of composition "obscure;" nevertheless, the late date assigned by some writers, is rejected. Professor Rawlinson also rejects the results announced by what he calls "the separating school of German critics." In fact, he is not much bothered by these "results." Those which others have found more or less difficult of adjustment, he brushes aside with calm indifference. He holds that Ezra wrote all of the book called by his name, or at least so far moulded it that the "redactor" did little to it. In Ezra he also finds the author of Chronicles, noting the predominating Levitical influence which colored both. In him he also finds the final editor of all the historical and most of the prophetical books, and the collector of some of the Psalms. What relation Ezra bore to the "Great Synagogue" is not wholly clear. He likewise holds that Zerubbabel was in possession of the whole of the Pentateuch in its present shape, when he established the worship of the returned exiles, in spite of the fact that the "divisions" of the priests and "courses" of the Levites, which he arranged, were foreign to the Pentateuchal code. It is the good old view which he presents, and it is antiquated even down to the use of "Chaldean," "Chaldee or Syriac," as the designation of the Aramaic. A queer contradiction may be noted. The number of those who remained behind when Zerubbabel led the way back to Palestine is placed (p. 12), on the authority of Bullock, in Smith's Dictionary, in the ratio of six to one to those who departed, while (p. 114), on the authority of Kuenen, it is said that they were "quite equal." There are some repetitions in the two portions of the work, and the above is one of them. It is very unfortunate that the type used in both of these books is so small as to render the reading of them a trial to the eye.

Israel: A Prince with God. The Story of Jacob re told, by *F. B. Meyer*, B.A. (New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 180, $1.) We have already had occasion to review other works of this writer, and to note the reverent spirit and the religious fervor which characterize them. In the present book we find the same qualities. It contains the essence of discourses delivered before his London congregation, and is intended, having been published at the request of many friends, to be an exhibition of the "constant well-spring of freshness, variety, and interest in the glorious biographies of Scripture." One's attention is not distracted by any question of criticism, but the story is told in plain, simple terms, and the lessons thence derived are couched in manly words. We have not discovered that he has been guilty of that sin of so many preachers, of taking such liberty with his subject, as to read into it a multitude of things which, while good and true in themselves, are nevertheless entirely foreign to the passage of Scripture in question.

Hunt & Eaton have recently republished in book form, a series of articles which appeared in the columns of the *Northern Christian Advocate* (Syracuse, N. Y.), under the title, *The Present State of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, a symposium edited by *George R. Crooks*, D.D. (1891, 12mo, pp. 96, 25 cents). While the work of the Church has been a grand work, and while it is worthy of all praise for what it has done, the writers of the articles here reproduced have hit upon some points at which the polity of the denomination is regarded as weak. Their statements are the more worthy of attention, because they come from men who are well known as loyal in their ecclesiastical connection and desirous of advancing the efficiency of their Church. Without passing judgment in any way on the matters discussed, a thing unbecoming in an outsider, it would seem as though radical reforms were possible and desirable in abatement of what such writers call "patronage," "schemers," "intrigue," "political methods," "place-hunters," "political debts," "combines," etc. Dr. Crooks hits hard when he says (p. 87): "Without some additional safeguards, the electioneering intrigues for this place (episcopate) will increase, will more and more corrupt, will destroy confidence in the distribution of the Church's patronage, and what will come after that God only can tell. And I beg to call attention to a fact that any open-eyed minister can read, to wit: That the proceedings of delegates to the last two General Conferences, in the filling of offices, have left our laity in a greater state of exasperation than has been known for years." These are hard words, doubly hard, as coming from such a man, not from one ecclesiastically opposed nor a backbiter.

The International Congregational Council, London, 1891. *Authorised Record of Proceedings.* With introduction by *R. W. Dale*, M.A., D.D., LL.D., President of the Council. Second edition. (London: J. Clarke & Co.; New York: Alfred Barnes; Boston: Congregational Publishing Society, 1891, 8vo, pp. xxxiii., 418, $1.75.) The mere mention of this book, with a statement as to publishers and price, is all that is needed. The circle of those to whom it will be of interest is, of course, well defined, but to such it will be valuable. It is a noble volume into which much has been packed; the pages are double-columned and the type is small, but the paper is excellent and the impression is good. We are informed that the edition is limited, and that the volume must shortly become scarce.

The Church for the Times. A series of sermons by *William Frederic Faber*. (Westfield, N. Y.: Lakeside Press, 1891, pp. 81, paper, 25 cents.) The topics treated are: The Church's Faith; Worship; The Divine Church; The Church's Mission; Methods; Confidence. The thought, style, temper, and matter of these sermons are strong, virile, noble, and quickening. Would that there were more Fabers. The insight of the man is seen in his criticism of the Confessional Revision in progress in the Presbyterian Church. "It is wide of the mark in proposing to improve a thoroughly self-consistent system by additions and excisions dictated by a different philosophy." Of the liberty which the Church should grant, he says: "If a man like Dr. Briggs to-day stands for anything, it is for the rightful claims of 'the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints.'" Truth is the foundation of the Church, and "To go about proclaiming that 'if a certain theory prove untrue, then the foundation is knocked out from under the Christian Church,' is of all methods of Gospel defence surely the most insane." "Perhaps there is no better proof of the divineness of the Church than her ability to suffer these things and yet live." The frightful spectre of "Biblical Criticism" is laid in very few words when it is said: ". . . Criticism—which is merely 'Study' in a different spelling. . . ." We only regret that space forbids any longer quotations from a book informed with a spirit of true catholicity, candor, earnestness, and Christian faith.

A volume containing eighteen sermons by the Rev. *S. D. McConnell*, D.D., rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, and author of a "History of the American Episcopal Church," which was recently reviewed in this magazine, has appeared under the title, *Sons of God.* (New York: Whittaker, 1891, 12mo, pp. vi., 259, $1.50.) The style of the sermons is that of a man in earnest, with short, nervous, clear, and lucid sentences. One is never at a loss to know what the preacher means. The truth to be inculcated is clearly presented, and is not trite or hackneyed. The reader need never become drowsy in his reading, and the preacher could never have needed the assistance of the ancient "tithingman" to keep his audience awake. These discourses might well serve as a model for the young minister, and their perusal by laity or clergy will bring forth good and only good.

Another volume, also containing eighteen discourses, is before us, bearing the title, *Three Gates on a Side, and other Sermons.* The author, the Rev. Dr. *Charles H. Parkhurst*, pastor of the Madison Square [Presbyterian] Church, New York, needs no introduction. The book contains some Sunday morning sermons, and some which have been preached before other than his own audience. The last one, "We Know in Part," was delivered before a crowded house at the last meeting of the Presbyterian General Assembly, at Detroit. From the midst of others of equal power, it is difficult to select any as specially excellent, for each shows the preacher in his fulness of spirit, wealth of diction, and brilliancy of thought. The present form gives hints of the loss which is inevitable in the transition from the spoken word to the printed page. The intonation and emphasis, impossible to type, italics and punctuation, nevertheless peers through these barriers, and we are conscious of a man. (Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 271.)

Baptismal Remission; or, The Design of Christian Baptism, by Rev. *G. W. Hughey*, D.D. (Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe; New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891, 12mo, pp. iv., 134, 60 cents.) The title of this book does it injustice, for the author does not hold at all to the notion that "baptismal remission" is the "design" of baptism. This is the view which he hotly combats, standing in entire antagonism to the views of the Romish Church, of Campbellites, and Mormons. The little volume is a brief and energetic denial and disproof of the positions held by adherents to these systems. Dr.

Hughey writes in a plain, unadorned style, having something to say and making no ado about the saying. The book will be of value to those who desire a presentation of the argument against the sacramentarian view, in brief, condensed, and succinct form. It would be asking too much to expect all to agree with the author's exegesis in all points, or to follow him when he incidentally makes Paul the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (p. 39); but in spite of some minor defects the book is one calculated to fill a place in theological literature, and to fill it well so far as it goes.

Departed Gods. The Gods of our Fathers is the title of a book by the Rev. *J. N. Fradenburgh*, Ph.D., D.D., President of the North Dakota University, which treats popularly of the mythology of the Greeks, Etruscans, Romans, Druids, and "Norse." It is the third in a series bearing upon the mythology of the ancients and the religions which yet prevail. "Fire from Strange Altars" deals with the religions of the peoples who surrounded Israel, while "Living Religions" had to do with the systems now met in mission fields. The present volume is not entirely covered by its title, unless we consider 'our fathers' to include the Indo-Germanic branch of the human family; but in that case the title is broader than the book. As a popular treatise the book is successful, but for advanced students of mythology it will be of little or no use. (Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe; New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891, 12mo, pp. 464, $1.20.)

Those who remember the volume called "The World's Laconics," published many years ago, will need no introduction to a similar work by the same hand, just from the press of the Cassell Publishing Company of New York. It is called *A Dictionary of Thoughts; being a Cyclopædia of Laconic Quotations from the best Authors, both Ancient and Modern*, by *Tryon Edwards*, D.D. Alphabetically arranged by subjects (1891, 8vo, pp. xii., 644, cloth, $5). The volume is well printed in small, though very clear type, is very complete and satisfactory, being the fruit of many years of labor, and embodying a most judicious selection. The names of authors who are quoted are enumerated to the number of no less than 1615, and the quotations must amount to about 20,000, under a thousand subjects. The quotations are all in prose, usually as brief as to be almost epigrammatic. The only criticism upon the whole performance regards the lack of definite reference to the source of the quotation.

The Redemption of Edward Strahan. A Social Story, by *W. J. Dawson.* (New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. iv., 262, $1.25.) As a novel this book is a failure; it has little of the elements which make a romance of the ordinary sort; but a romance the author did not intend to write. As a portrayal of the experiences through which the hero passed, and of the things which caused him to attain to the full stature of a man, the book is very successful inside of its limits. The "redemption" of the title is the recognition of the fact that the life of Jesus is a power which time cannot weaken, an influence which circumstance cannot affect, a reality which can be actualized day by day, in the ordinary life of the ordinary man. The problem of social amelioration, which is the burden of the book, is not solved. Again we stand at the inauguration of the "People's Palace;" its future work and its success are left to the imagination, while still the problem presses upon us, What can be done to remove the things which give Socialism its power? Where is the balm to cure the ills of humanity? The author's answer is in a just conception of Christianity as a life, but how shall blinded men be made to see it?

The author writes well generally, and some of the pages have a fire which is begotten of earnestness; but there are occasional slips which betray an American mode of expression, though the tale is English. "La-di-da sort of women" (p. 100) has a peculiarly American twang. ". . . that will be just a family," savors of a Western idiom. "Suited me down to the ground all the same" (p. 236) seems to have a familiar sound. There are some slips of grammar as well. "One" as an antecedent followed by "he" and "him" is common, but scarcely correct. ". . . But they did not know who," *may* be an error of proof-reading, of which there are several in the book; but the author will have accomplished his purpose if he shall succeed in calling attention to the problem of life, which he has attempted to illustrate in some of its phases.

The Fleming H. Revell Co., of Chicago and New York, have issued four little booklets which are all neat and pretty. *The Startled Sewing Society*, by Mrs. *L. H. Crane*, describes a dream portraying the various attitudes of mind of a "society" during whose session the Lord Jesus was announced. The moral is drawn from Matt. xxv. 40. (25 cents).—Those who have heard the words of beauty and earnestness which fall from the lips of Mrs. *Ballington Booth* in her public addresses, will not question the statement that she is true to herself in the little sermon before us, *Wanted—"Antiseptic Christians."* It pulsates with the same feelings which she impresses upon her auditors. (25 cents).—*The Dew of thy Youth* is an address to the young people of the Society of Christian Endeavor, by Rev. *J. R. Miller*, D.D., of Philadelphia. It is issued in the hope of a wider influence for good. (20 cents.)—*Temptation. A Talk to Young Men*, is by *James Stalker*, D.D., the Yale lecturer on Preaching for 1891. It is an admirable and plain statement of the attitudes of young men to that which has the power of determining destiny for weal or woe. (20 cents.)

QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

New Englander and Yale Review, New Haven, Dec., 1891.

The article, "James Russell Lowell," by D. H. Chamberlain, New York City, is a blending of biography and commentary, of psychology and criticism, and belongs to that style of modern essays which, when proceeding from a spirited pen, may be as instructive as entertaining. In "Higher Education and Practical Life," Mr. Winthrop Dudley Sheldon, North Cambridge, Mass., points out that the so-called self-made man in reality always is made by an opportunity rather than by himself, that practical smartness always is a natural gift rather than the result of education, etc., and then goes on to show that higher education adds something to what technical education can give, which is of the highest value also in practical life. "What May We Preach?" by John S. Sewall, Bangor Theological Seminary, is an effective antidote to that peculiar dread, not so very uncommon among young pastors, that the texts may be exhausted and they find themselves some day in the pulpit without any fit subject.

The Theological Monthly, London, Dec., 1891.

The opening article, "The Restraining Influence," is an elaborate commentary on 2 Thess. ii. 6–8 by Paton J. Gloag, D.D. Then follows the third part of "The Bible and Science," by James McCann, D.D., giving an outline of what may properly be called the biography of a world from its birth to its death, and winding up with its resurrection and the permanence of humanity. "Is there a Deuteronomist in Joshua?" by Stilon Henning, derives from the Book of Joshua a strong argument against the destructive school of criticism fighting under the banner of Wellhausen, while the third part of "Exegetical Hints on the Old Testament," by A. R. Fausset, D.D., goes on in a purely exegetical strain. The article "Gehenna and Hell," by Canon Mathews, is not so much a contribution to the solution of the general eschatological questions, as an attempt to penetrate through the mass of more or less accidental associations which during periods of theological controversies have accumulated around almost every word of the Bible, and establish the original meaning of the word in its primitive simplicity and naturalness, such as it was known to and used by the writer. Of a somewhat similar character, though with a more strongly pronounced polemical tendency, is "Hilkiah's Book of the Law," by Thomas Whitelaw, D.D.

The Expositor, London, Dec., 1891.

The number opens with the second part of "The Present Position of the Johannean Question," by Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D., Oxford, treating of the external evidence, and arriving at the result that it will become increasingly probable that St. John is the author of the book which has come down to us under his name. "Dr. Dale's Theology," by Rev. Professor J. S. Candlish, D.D., is a review of a new volume of discourses by R. W. Dale, LL.D., Birmingham, "Fellowship with Christ," but in the form of an exposition of certain difficult points in the theology of the author. In "The Aramaic Gospel," Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, M.A., Manchester, gives a very striking instance of duplicate translations from the Aramaic Gospel in the Gospel of Mark, and builds up a most substantial support for his argument by giving a survey of the various circumstances which make the singular phenomenon quite natural. "The Divine Looking-glass," by Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D., is a homily on James i. 22–25, and the article "Upon Philo's Text of the Septuagint," by Frederick C. Conybeare, M.A., gives an idea of the value which can be ascribed to the quotations from the Septuagint found in the works of Philo.

The Review of the Churches, London, Nov. 16th, 1891.

Under the general title "The Progress of the Churches" are given Church of England notes by Archdeacon Farrar: on the Church Congress at Rhyl, the position of the Church in Wales, biblical criticism, clerical poverty, etc.; Presbyterian notes by Dr. Donald Fraser: on the training of ministers, competitive preaching, the labor question in Australia, etc.; Congregational notes by Dr. Mackennal: on the autumnal assembly of the Congregational Union at Southport, the place of women in churches, Christian unity, etc.; Baptist notes by Dr. Clifford: on the meeting of the Baptist Union at Manchester, the union of Independents and Baptists, the American Institute of Sacred Literature, Mr. Spurgeon and Dr. Pierson; Methodist notes by W. T. Dawson: on the Œcumenical Conference, the conservatism of American Methodism, Methodism and the Church of England, etc. Under the general title of "The Reunion of Christendom," are given articles by Cardinal Manning, Professor A. B. Bruce, and Dr. Martineau, which we reprint in the present number of our magazine. As "The Great Philanthropics II." Archdeacon Farrar gives a luminous and very impressive description of the Regent Street Polytechnic with many illustrations.

The Old and New Testament Student, Hartford, Conn., Dec., 1891.

"A Stage in Paul's Spiritual Development," by Professor Charles H. Small, B.D., Washington, D. C., begins with the thesis: "Paul's conversion was the rather a new stage in his remarkable spiritual development, and not the first stage, and ends with the question": Does conversion to Christianity always coincide with the true conversion of the soul? "A Question of Space," by Rev. William H. Cobb, Newton Centre, Mass., is a commentary on Isa. xiv., and "The Proverbs of the Bible and other Proverbs," by Rev. George S. Goodspeed, Ph.D., Chicago, Ill., points out the similarity and dissimilarity between the former and the latter, characterizing the Scripture Proverbs as an outgrowth not of popular experience, but of literary study. Then follow the third part of "The Bible in English Life and Letters," by Rev. J. G. K. McClure, D.D., Lake Forest, Ill., "Inductive Study of the Founding of the Christian Church," by C. W. Votaw, and "The Gospel of John," by William R. Harper and George S. Goodspeed.

The Young Man, London, Dec., 1891.

The third part of "Off Duty; or, the Religion of our Leisure Hours," by Rev. J. Reid Howatt, author of "Agnostic Fallacies," etc., has the subtitle, Books and Reading. The eleventh instalment of "Leaders in Thought and Action," by W. J. Dawson, gives a very spirited and striking characterization of Mark Guy Pearse. In "The Young Men of India," Mr. David McConaughy, M.A., Secretary of the Indian National Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations, gives an account of the Young Men's Christian Association in India, and in number VI, of "Great Books and their Authors," Mr. W. H. Davenport Adams treats of Tasso and "Jerusalem Delivered."

The Newberry House Magazine, London and Sydney, Dec., 1891.

The opening article, "What Will be the Future of Religious Education in Elementary Schools?" by the Very Rev. Dean of St. Paul's, Robert Gregory, reviews the influence exercised by the Educational Act of 1870 upon the elementary schools of England, and makes inferences with regard to the probable influence of the Free Educational Act of 1891. In "China and its Future" Rev. R. Brooks Egan gives a very interesting account of the present state of affairs in the Celestial Empire, which he, declining to believe that the monumental fixity of Chinese ways is as true in reality as it is proverbial in Europe, interprets in analogy with what took place in Japan twenty years ago. Somewhat in the same vein runs "Buddhism and Lamaism in Mongolia," by Rev. John Sheepshanks, while "Historical Sketches, VI., The Church and the Great Charta," by Rev. Canon Pennington, is a chapter of general Church history. Besides a proper account of Christmas carols and Christmas stories, the number also contains "Melchizedek, King of Salem," by Rev. A. H. Sayce, LL.D., giving an illustration of the way in which Oriental researches vindicate the historical character of the Old Testament.

Good Words, London, Dec., 1891.

Besides its instalments of fiction the present number contains two interesting and richly illustrated travelling sketches: "A Trip up Snowland" (Iceland), by Sir George H. B. Macleod, M.D., and "The Highest Town in the Highlands" (Tamintool), by Charles Blatherwick; an article by Archdeacon Farrar, D.D., "Epitaphs in Westminster Abbey," which will be found reprinted in the present number of our magazine; and "Heaven Revealed in Us," Sunday readings by Archibald Scott, D.D.

The Missionary Review, New York and London, Dec., 1891.

The report of the foreign mission day at Northfield Convention presents much new and interesting information concerning the progress of missionary work in China and India, and this, together with the article by Rev. John McLaurins, "The Influence of the Pariah Christians of Southern India on the Christianization of the Country," affords a good idea of the immensity, the importance, and the success of the work. Concerning Judaism, Jews, and Palestine the number contains: "The Sacred Land of Palestine," by Mrs. David Baron; "The Evangelization of Israel," by Professor George H. Schodde, Ph.D.; "Some Polemical Writings against the Jews in the first Seven Centuries," by Rev. B. Pick, Ph.D.; "Jerusalem's Crying Wants," by Rabbi A. Ben-Oliel, and "The Jews and Jerusalem," by William E. Blackstone. A letter from Rev. J. G. Patton shows what havoc the Kanaka labor traffic and the foreign whiskey trade play with the work of the missionaries in Australia; sometimes the itinerating services have to be suspended altogether for lack of preachers. The great question is to get those two great evils stopped, and Mr. Patton adds that if America would agree to the restrictions, other nations would too.

The Unitarian Review, Boston and London, Dec., 1891.

"The Heresy of Non-Progressive Orthodoxy," by William M. Bryant starts from the thesis, that a perfect revelation presupposes not only a perfect mind revealing itself, but also a perfect mind to receive that which is revealed. As now the divine revelation can never be perfect for any finite mind, it demands that the normal finite mind shall be progressive, and thus a non-progressive orthodoxy becomes a heresy. "The Day of Reconciliation," by George W. Buckley, Battle Creek, Mich., represents the ever clearer realization of the unity of nature, the unity of man, the unity of a divine personality as the natural outcome of the vast-reaching process of evolution, and harmonizes perfectly with the "History as Development," by Charles Chauncy Shackford. The number also contains a review of "General Booth's Experiment," by Herbert V. Mills, the author of "Poverty and the State," and a memorial of President Hill.

The Charities Review, New York, Dec., 1891.

Among the several articles of the present number, all on live questions ably discussed, "A Word to Trades Unions," by Professor Jeremiah W. Jenks, Ph.D., Cornell University, tries to make trades unionists see that any limitation of a man's output, by rules which prevent him from working his best during the time that he is employed, not only does not furnish employment for the unemployed, but rather has the opposite effect, while it is also injurious to the workman himself and to industrial society as a whole. "Free Education and Free Food," by Amos G. Warner, Ph.D., Superintendent of Charities, District of Columbia, demonstrates the former as a harmless specific for ignorance and the latter as a dangerous remedy for destitution, and thus establishes a sharp distinction between the underlying principles. "Neighborhood Guilds," by Edward King, is a review of a recent publication of that name by Stanton Coit, Ph.D., Lecturer of the South Place Ethical Society, London, and of the first application of that instrument of social reform which he made some years ago in the city of New York.

The Treasury, New York and London, Dec., 1891.

The present number contains a sermon on the "Co-operation of the Divine and Human in Nature and in Grace," by Rev. Benjamin Bushrod Tyler, D.D., pastor of the Church of the Disciples of Christ, New York City, as also his biography by M. C. Tiers; furthermore, an article on "Dr. Briggs's Biblical Theology," by Professor Robert Watts; and "The City: A Glory and a Menace," by Bishop Cyrus D. Foss, in connection with which should be read "What Theological Students Should Study," by Professor Marcus D. Buell, Boston University School of Theology. It also contains, as usual, "Leading Thoughts of Sermons," "Sunday-School Cause," and under "Questions of the Day": "Have we a Right to Protect the Sabbath by Law?" by A. T. Wolff, D.D., Ph.D., which question is answered in the affirmative.

The Missionary Herald, Boston, Dec., 1891.

To the question, "Do Missions Pay?" Rev. Joseph K. Greene, D.D., of Constantinople, gives an affirmative answer by laying before the reader an account of the history and present state of the evangelical institution at Adabazar in Anatolia. In "The Gods of the Chinese," Rev. Henry P. Perkins, of Lin-Ching, North China, presents us with a picture of what the Chinese mean when they speak of God and how they demean themselves when they wish to enter into some relation with Him, a picture as grossly absurd as horribly degraded. Among the interesting correspondences of the number are letters from Japan, Western and Eastern Turkey, India, and China.

Sunday Magazine, London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, Dec., 1891.

Besides the usual instalments of fiction and some interesting and well illustrated sketches from nature, the present number contains: "The Return of the Magi," by Rev. J. Reid Howatt, and "The

Sign : a Babe," by J. Monro Gibson. M.A., D.D., half poetical and half edificatory in character. "Secrets Worth Knowing," by Rev. A. N. Mackray, M.A., has a somewhat similar character, but being Sunday evenings with the children, an element of instruction is added.

The Homiletic Review, New York and London, Dec., 1891.

Besides its Review Section and Sermonic Section, the present number contains : "Helps and Hints," by Arthur T. Pierson, D.D., an analysis of Eph. v. 18 and of the Lord's Prayer ; "Studies in the Psalter," by Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., a commentary of the 22d Psalm ; and an "Exegetical Study of 1 Peter iii. 18-22," by Rev. D. F. Bonner, D.D., Florida, N. Y. "The Gap between the Poor and the Churches," by Rev. P. Robertson, Cincinnati, O., points out the causes of the estrangement between the churches and the poorer classes, and indicates the remedies against it. The European Department, conducted by J. H. W. Stuckenberg, D.D., Berlin, Germany, has a very interesting section : "The Deeper Problems," setting forth and explaining the peculiar character which Christian theology has assumed in modern civilization, and another section "Mistakes Respecting the German Army," a plea for the standing army which, though it may not be accepted as sufficient, contains much that should not be overlooked.

The Andover Review, Boston, Dec., 1891.

The opening article, "The Biblical Conditions of Salvation," by William Hayes Ward, D.D., is a study and exposition of the answers which the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures give to the question, What is the Chief End of Man? In "The Halo of Industrial Idleness," Morrison I. Swift, Ravenna, O., disentangles the various fallacies which arise from confounding capital with its owners. In "Three Critics," Professor George R. Carpenter, Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass., gives a sharp, tolerably just, very instructive, and thoroughly delightful characterization of the criticisms of W. D. Howells, George Moore, and Oscar Wilde. The article "A Word in Behalf of Endomism," by Rev. William Forbes Cooley, Short Hills, N. J., is an answer to "The Challenge of Life," by Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster in the September number, and the answer is able and considerate. though, like "The Challenge," hardly able to draw the reader from that standpoint upon which his individual temperament may have fixed him.

Christian Thought, New York, Dec., 1891.

In "The Trend of Philosophy," Rev. J. D. Gold, M.A., Ph.D., traces the tendency of the sceptical side of modern speculation from Locke to Hegel to undermine knowledge and render reality an unknown quantity, and demonstrates how action always meets with a corresponding reaction which keeps up the connection between theology and philosophy. Then follows an exposition of Professor George S. Morris's philosophy, by Professor A. B. Curtis, giving also an outline of his biography. "Ethicless Data," by T. E. Fleming, Ph.D., is a very severe onslaught on Herbert Spencer's "Data of Ethics," in which the author finds the ethical left out. In "The Intuitionalism of Locke," Duncan Campbell Lee, Vice-Principal of the Cascadella School, Ithaca, N. Y., vindicates Locke's philosophy against the accusation of being the germ from which sprung the modern destructive school of philosophy. The number also contains a very learned and instructive article on "Mystical Buddhism," by Sir Monier Williams.

CONTENTS OF JANUARY MAGAZINES.

Harper's Magazine for January presents to its readers an unrivalled variety of attractions. It opens with a charming short story, "De Littl' Modder." by William McLennan, written in the quaintly picturesque dialect of the Canadian *habitant*, and appropriately illustrated by C. S. Reinhart. William Dean Howells contributes an attractive and amusing farce, "A Letter of Introduction," which is accompanied by four attractive pictures drawn by W. T. Smedley. "Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne" is the subject of an intensely interesting article by Horatio Bridge, who was Mr. Hawthorne's college classmate and life-long intimate friend. An entertaining story, "A Fourth-class Appointment," fully illustrated by C. D. Gibson, is contributed by Margaret Deland, author of "John Ward, Preacher." In a valuable article entitled "Canada's El Dorado," Julian Ralph gives a comprehensive description of the territory of British Columbia, its present condition and resources and its future possibilities. This article is accompanied by a number of characteristic pictures drawn by Frederic Remington. Following it is a charming poem by Arlo Bates, "The Sorrow of Rohab," beautifully illustrated by J. R. Weguelin. Walter S. Drysdale contributes a graphic and impartial narrative of "Aaron Burr's Conspiracy and Trial," with which is given a full-page portrait of Burr from the painting in possession of the Century Club, New York. The plans, promises, and prospects of "Our Exposition at Chicago," as they appear after a personal visit to the grounds, are clearly set forth and described in another article by Julian Ralph. Wilhelm Singer contributes an entertaining paper on "Popular Life in the Austro-Hungarian Capitals," the interest of which is enhanced by sixteen illustrations drawn by Myrbach. The "Neo-Christian Movement in France" is discussed in a thoughtful article by the Vicomte Eugène Melchior de Vogüé. Walter Besant adds another chapter to his admirable series of London papers, in a remarkably interesting account of the "London of Charles the Second," which is accompanied by numerous appropriate illustrations.

The Century for January has these contents : Portrait of Charles François Gounod, frontispiece ; "The Jews in New York," Richard Wheatley ; "Milan Cathedral," Douglas Sladen ; "The Naulahka," a story of West and East, III., Rudyard Kipling and Wolcott Balestier ; "Andrea Del Sarto" (Italian Old Masters), W. J. Stillman, engravings and note by Timothy Cole ; "Custer's Last Battle," by one of his troop commanders, Captain E. L. Godfrey ; comments by General James B. Fry ; "Gounod in Italy and Germany," Charles François Gounod ; "The Jewish Question," Josephus ; "The Cloud-Maiden," William Wilfred Campbell ; "The Alligator Hunters of Louisiana," Andrews Wilkinson ; "Witchcraft," J. M. Buckley ; "A Parting Guest," Meredith Nicholson ; "Characteristics," II.. S. Weir Mitchell, M.D. ; "Dolce Far Niente," from a painting by Will H. Low ; "A Garland," Frank Dempster Sherman ; "New Year's Eve," Alice Williams Brotherton ; "Bentley's System," Viola Roseboro' ; "The Discontent of the Farmer," J. R. Dodge ; "A Battle in Crackerdom," Harry Stillwell Edwards ; "Sonnet on the Sonnet," Inigo Deane ; "Interludes," Fireflies—A Parable—Art—Transformation—Death Defied, Thomas Bailey Aldrich. Topics of the Time : "The Progressive Discovery of America ;" "Alabama's Thousand-Dollar-a-Day Blunder ;" "Mississippi's Crop-Moving Currency ;" "Attacks upon Public Parks ;" "Progress of Ballot Reform." Colorado. Open Letters : "M. Gounod and his Ideals," H. E. Krehbiel ; "The Camp Morton Controversy," W. R. Holloway and John A. Wyeth ; "Will H. Low," W. Lewis Fraser ; "Notes on 'General Miles's Indian Campaigns.'" George L. Spining and G. W. Baird. In Lighter Vein : "Songs of Ireland," Jennie E. T. Dowe ; "An Old Belle," L. W. Reese ; "The Silent Partner." Edith M. Thomas ; "Reflections," J. A. Macon : "A Lover's Plaint," Mary Ainge DeVere ; "The Lost Song," George Horton ; "Only a Hint," George Moore.

Lippincott's for January has the following contents : "The Passing of Major Kilgore" (told by the city editor), by Young E. Allison ; "The Editor-in-Chief," by Colonel A. K. McClure ; "Great Pan is Dead !" by Henry Peterson ; "The Decline of Politeness," by Amelia E. Barr ; "My Love and I," by Albert Payson Terhune ; "The Triumph of Mogley," by Robert Neilson Stephens ; "A Fragment," by Daniel L. Dawson ; "With the Gloves—Boxing," by Daniel L. Dawson ; "The Young Girl," by Frederic M. Bird ; "At Dawn," by John B. Tabb ; "The Interpreter" (Sidney Woollett). by Julian Hawthorne ; "The Gudewife," by James Whitcomb Riley ; "Agnes Huntington," by J. F. R. ; "On a Blind Girl," by John Ernest McCann ; "Consolation for the Ugly Girls," by Frances Albert Doughty ; "The Botts Twins," by P. R. Stansbury ; "As it Seems ;" "A Literary Conversation," by Julian Hawthorne ; "A Frenchman in America," by Melville Philips ; "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading artists).

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE MISSIONARY HERALD.

Boston, December, 1891.

Another Life Laid Down for Africa. Rev. George Constantine, D D.

Do Missions Pay? Rev. Joseph K. Greene, D.D.

The Gods of the Chinese. Rev. Henry T. Perkins.

An Armenian Pastor. Rev. Cyrus Hamlin, D.D.

UNITARIAN REVIEW.

Boston and London, December, 1891.

The Heresy of Non-Progressive Orthodoxy. William M. Bryant.

The Day of Reconciliation. George W. Buckley.

History as Development. Charles Chauncy Shackford.

James Russell Lowell. John W. Chadwick.

General Booth's Experiment. Herbert V. Mills.

Thomas Hill. J. H. A.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., December, 1891.

Llewelyn Joan Evans. Prof. Arthur C. McGiffert.

A Stage in Paul's Spiritual Development. Prof. Charles H. Small, B.D.

A Question of Space. Rev. Wm. H. Cobb.

The Proverbs of the Bible and Other Proverbs. Rev. George S. Goodspeed, Ph.D.

The Bible in English Life and Letters. III. Rev. J. G. K. McClure, D.D.

Inductive Study of the Founding of the Christian Church. C. W. Votaw.

The Gospel of John.

William R. Harper and George S. Goodspeed.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, December, 1891.

The Present Position of the Johannean Question. II. Rev. Prof. W. Sanday, D.D.

Dr. Dale's Theology. Rev. Prof. J. T. Marshall, M.A.

The Aramaic Gospel. Rev. Prof. J. T. Marshall, M.A.

The Divine Looking-Glass. Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D.

Upon Philo's Text of the Septuagint. Fred. C. Conybeare, M.A.

The New Edition of Baedeker's "Palestine."

Revs. George Adam Smith and W. Ewing.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

New Haven, Conn., December, 1891.

James Russell Lowell. D. H. Chamberlain.

The Official Ballot in Elections. Henry T. Blake.

Some Recent Writings of an Indian Rajah.

The Higher Education and Practical Life. Winthrop Dudley Sheldon.

What May We Preach? John S. Sewall.

THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

London, December, 1891.

The Restraining Influence. 2 Thess. ii. 6–8. Paton J. Gloag, D.D.

The Bible and Science. III. James McCann, D.D.

Is there a Deuteronomist in Joshua? Stilon Henning.

Exegetical Hints on the Old Testament. III. Canon Fausset, D.D.

Gehenna and Hell. Canon Mathews.

Hilkiah's Book of the Law. Thomas Whitelaw, D.D.

GOOD WORDS.

London, December, 1891.

The Marriage of Elinor. XLV.–XLVIII. Mrs. Oliphant.

A Trip to Snowland. Sir George H. B. Macleod, M.D.

In the Days of Hadassah. William Canton.

The Highest Town in the Highlands. Charles Blatherwick.

Of Saying Good-bye. A. K. H. B.

Sparks from a Yule-Log. Geoffrey Winterwood.

Epitaphs in Westminster Abbey. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D.

The Music of Nature. J. F. Rowbothan.

A Curfew Song. Arthur L. Salmon.

The Little Minister. XLIII.–XLV. J. M. Barrie.

Heaven Revealed in Us. Archibald Scott, D.D.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Edinburgh, December, 1891.

Panic and the Fear of God. Rev. James Macgregor, D.D.

Summum Bonum. Rev. W. Bradfield, B.A.

Luther's Psalm. Rev. J. P. Lilley, B.D.

A Mock Sacrament.

Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D.D., LL.D., F. R.S.E.

Expository Papers.

Biblical Archæology and Higher Criticism. Prof. A. H. Sayce, LL.D.

The Great Text Commentary.

The Early Narratives of Genesis. IV. Rev. Prof. H. E. Ryle, M.A.

F. H. A. Scrivener. Rev. Principal D. Brown, D.D.

The Ethiopic Manuscripts of Enoch. Rev. R. H. Charles, M.A.

THE YOUNG MAN.

London, December, 1891.

A Lucky Hit. Edward Garrett.

Off Duty; or, the Religion of our Leisure Hours. Rev. J. Reid Howatt.

Great Books and their Authors. W. H. Davenport Adams.

Science up to Date. Frank Ballard, M.A.

The Young Men of India. David McConaughy, M.A.

What We Live by. Archdeacon Farrar.

Echoes from the Study. W. J. Dawson.

The End of the Year. Dr. Clifford.

THE NEWBERY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London and Sydney, December, 1891.

What Will Be the Future of Religious Education in Elementary Schools? Very Rev. the Dean of St. Paul's.

The Service of Work. A. B. Tucker.

China and Its Future. Rev. R. Brooks Eoan.

Melchizedek, King of Salem. Rev. A. H. Sayce, LL.D.

Historical Sketches. VI. Rev. Canon Pennington.

The Lady of Carmuir. Alice Weber.

Buddhism and Lamaism in Mongolia. Rev. John Sheepshanks.

No Compromise. XVIII.–XX.

Helen F. Hetherington and Rev. H. Darwin Burton.

The Highwaymen. Florence Scannell.

A Sinhalese Theatre. Rev. William Wood, D.D.

Uncle Archie. A. M. Orr.

THE TREASURY.

New York, December, 1891.

The Co-operation of the Divine and Humane in Nature and in Grace. B. B. Tyler, D.D.

Benjamin Bushrod Tyler. M. C. Tiers.

Dr. Briggs's Biblical Theology. Prof. Robert Watts.

The City: A Glory and a Menace. Bishop Cyrus D. Foss.

Ministerial Culture and Efficiency. Rev. S. S. Martin, A.M.

What Theological Students Should Study. Prof. Marcus D. Buell.

Have We a Right to Protect the Sabbath by Law? A. T. Wolff, D.D., Ph.D.

The Treasury in the Family. Rev. N. D. Williamson.

Christian Edification. A. P. Gifford, D.D.

SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Dec., 1891.

Godiva Durleigh (Conclusion). Sarah Doudney.

The Return of the Magi. Rev. J. Reid Howatt.

A Cup of Cold Water. Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A.

The Sign: A Babe. G. Monro Gibson, M.A., D.D.

Birds on Their Travels. Rev. Theodore Wood.

Two Scenes in Bristol. Sophia Wilson.

A Working-Girls' Club

A Chinese "God in Office." Alfred J. Bamford.

Pris (Conclusion).

Secrets Worth Knowing. Rev. A. N. Mackay, M.A.

THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

London, December, 1891.

The Reunion of Christendom.

Cardinal Manning, Prof. Bruce, and Dr. Martineau.

The Methodist Presidents (Illustrated).

Regent Street Polytechnic. Archdeacon Farrar.

A "Reunion" Trip to Norway.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW.

New York and London, December, 1891.

The Foreign Mission Day at Northfield Convention. Louise B. and Anna W. Pierson.

The Sacred Land of Palestine Mrs. David Baron.

European Literature in the Mission Fields. F. F. Ellinwood, D.D.

The Evangelization of Israel. Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph.D.

Some Polemical Writings against the Jews. Rev. B. Pick, Ph.D.

The Tour of the Lantern. F. E. Hoskins.

Jerusalem's Crying Wants. Rabbi A. Ben-Oliel.

The Influence of the Pariah Christians. Rev. John McLaurin.

The Jews and Jerusalem. William E. Blackstone.

British Foreign Missions. Rev. James Johnston.

THE CHARITIES REVIEW.

New York, December, 1891.

Workingman's Insurance. Prof. Richmond Mayo-Smith, A.M.

A Word to Trades-Unions. Prof. Jeremiah W. Jenks, Ph.D.

Manual Training. Mrs. Isabel C. Barrows.

Co-operation against Beggary. John Glenn.

Free Food and Free Education. Amos G. Warner, Ph.D.

Neighborhood Guilds: an Instrument of Reform. Edward King.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, December, 1891.

The Biblical Condition of Salvation. William Hayes Ward, D.D.

The Halo of Industrial Idleness. Morrison J. Swift, Esq.

Three Critics: Mr. Howells, Mr. Moore, and Mr. Wilde. Prof. George R. Carpenter.

The New Course of Study of Adelbert College. President Thwing.

A Word in Behalf of Endomonism. Rev. W. Forbes Cooley.

P. S. to a Monist. Prof. E. H. Johnson.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York and London, December, 1891.

Helps and Hints, Textual and Topical. Arthur T. Pierson, D.D.

The Prayer-Meeting Service. Wayland Hoyt, D.D.

Studies in the Psalter. Talbot W. Chambers, D.D.

An Exegetical Study of 1 Peter iii. 18–22. D. F. Bonner.

The Gap between the Poor and the Churches. Rev. T. Robertson.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.

New York, December, 1891.

The Trend of Philosophy. Rev. J. D. Gold, M.A., Ph.D.

Prof. George S. Morris. Prof. A. B. Curtis.

Ethicless Data. T. E. Fleming, Ph.D., D.D.

The Intuitionalism of Locke. Duncan Campbell Lee.

Mystical Buddhism. Sir Monier-Williams.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Abaelardi, peripatetici Palatini Petri, hymnarius paraditensis sine hymnorum libelli iii. ad fidem codicum Bruxellensis et Calmontani edidit Guido Maria Dreves. Paris: Lethielleux, 1891. Pp. 292, 8vo, 4 mk.

Alamannus, Cosmus, S. J. Summa philosophiæ, ex variis libris D. Thomæ Aquinatis doctoris angelici in ordinem cursus philosophici accommodata. Editio Juxta II., parisiensem Vulgatam a canonicis regularibus Ord. S. Ang. congregationis gallicanæ adornata ab Augusto Bringmann, S. J. Tomus III. Sectio V. Ethica. Paris: Lethielleux, 1891. Pp. x., 216, 8vo, 6.40 mk.

Athenagoræ libellus pro Christianis, oratio de resurrectione cadaverum. Recensuit F. Schwartz. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. IV. Band, 2 Heft.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 132, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Atkins, Frederick A. First Battles and How to Fight Them. Some Friendly Chats with Young Men. Introduction by Thain Davidson, D.D. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 119, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Avetta, A. Abbozzo di una bibliografia critica a soggetti delle scienze filosofiche. Torino: 1891. Pp. 81, 8vo. (4 mk.)

Bacher, Wilhelm, Prof., Dr. Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer. 1. Band. Vom Abschluss der Mischna bis zum Tode Jochanans. (220 bis 279 nach der Zeitrechnung.) Strassburgi, E.: Trübner, 1891. Pp. xvi., 587, 8vo, 10 mk.

Bachmann, J. Praeparation und Kommentar zu den Psalmen mit genanen Analysen und getreaer Uebersetzung, für Gymnasiasten, Studierende und Candidaten herausgegeben. 5. Heft. Psalmen 90–118. Berlin: Schneider, 1891. Pp. 341–422, 8vo, 1.40 mk.

Backofen, Ch. Essai sur l'ecclésiologie de Zwingli. Genève: Georg, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo, 1.50 fr.

Balg, G. H., Ph.D. The First Germanic Bible Translated from the Greek. By the Gothic Bishop Wulfia, in the fourth century; and other remains of the Gothic language. Edited with an introduction, a syntax, and a glossary. New York: Westermann, 1891. Pp. xxi., 469, 8vo.

Barde, P. Esquisse des idées théologiques de G. E. Lessing. Thèse. Genève: George, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo, 2 fr.

Baring-Gould, S. Freaks of Fanaticism, and Other Strange Events. London: Methuen, 1891. Pp. 360, p. 8vo, 6s. (A new ed. of second series of "Historic Oddities.")

Bassermann, Heinr., Prof., Dr. Geschichte der evangelischen Gottesdienstordnung in badischen Landen, Zugleich ein Beitrag zum liturgischem Studium. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1891. Pp. vi., 259, 8vo, 4 mk.

Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprach-Wissenschaft, herausgegeben von Frdr. Delitzsch und Paul Haupt. Mit Unterstützung der Johns Hopkins Universität zu Baltimore. 2. Band. 1. Heft. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. 273, 8vo, 17 mk.

Bentley, W. Holman. Life on the Kongo. Revised and enlarged. Oakland, Cal., Pac. Press. Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. x., 158, 12mo, 60 cts. (Originally published London: Rel. Tr. Soc., 1887.)

Bertrand, Alexis. Lexique de philosophie, Paris: Delaplane, 1891. Pp. xvi., 221, 8vo, 3.50 fr.

Beste, J. Wilhelm Beste. Ein Lebensbild. Wolfenbüttel: Zwissler, 1891. Pp. viii., 322, 8vo, 3 mk.

Beyschlag, W. Neutestamentliche Theologie oder geschichtliche Darstellung der Lehren Jesu und das Urchristentums nach den neutestamentlichen Quellen. In 2 Bänden. 1. Band. Halle A. S.: Strien, 1891. Pp. viii., 410, 8vo, 8 mk.

Biblical Difficulties, and How to Meet Them: a series of papers by Dr. Clifford, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Rev. J. Hiles Hitchens, A. R. Buckland, F. Ballard, and others. London: Partridge, 1891. Pp. 96, 12mo, 1s.

Bick' ll, Prof. The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual: being a translation of the substance of Professor Bickell's work termed "Messe und Pascha." By William F. Skene, with an introduction by the translator on the connection of the early Christian Church with the Jewish Church. Edinburgh: Clark, 1891. Pp. 230, p. 8vo, 5s.

Black, J. S. Book of Joshua. With Map, Introduction, and Notes. London: Cambr. Wareh., 1891. Pp. 102, 18mo, 1s. (Smaller Cambridge Bible.)

Bonar, Andrew A., Rev., D.D. Memoir and Remains of the Rev Robert Murray McCheyne. With Portrait. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 598, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Boniface VIII., Les Registres de. Recueil des bulles de ce pape, publiées ou analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux des archives du Vatican, par Georges Digard, Maurice Faucon, et Antoine Thomas. 6e fascicule, Paris: Thorin, 1891. Pp. 322–554, 4to, 9 fr.

Bonk, H. De Davide, Israelitarum rege. Pars I.: quæstiones criticæ et historicæ in fontes habitæ. Dissertation, 1891. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo, 2 mk.

Boston Homilies. Short Sermons on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. By members of the Alpha Chapter of the Convocation of Boston University. Second Series. New York: Meth. Book Concern, 1891. Pp. 427, 8vo, $1.25.

Boucher, J. S. A Manual of Doctrine and Practical Notes for Church Teachers: a series of "Lecture Note" papers. London: Griffith, 1891. Pp. 276, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Bournand, François. Histoire de l'art chrétien, des origines à nos jours (architecture, sculpture, peinture, arts décoratifs, mobilier, musique). 2 vols. Paris: Blond, 1891. Pp. iv., 330; 396, avec gravures.

Bourquin, A. Étude critique sur l'authenticité des épitres pastorales. Thèse. Genève: George, 1890. Pp. 74, 8vo.

Breed, Daniel R., D.D. A History of the Preparation of the World for Christ. Chicago: Y. M. Era Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. ii., 388, 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

Brocking, W. Die französische Politik Papst Leos IX. Ein Beitrag Zur Geschichte des Papsttums in 11. Jahrhunderte. Stuttgart: Göschen, 1891. Pp. v., 106, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Brugsch, Henry. Egypt Under the Pharaohs. New ed. Condensed and thoroughly revised by M. Brodrick. With maps, plans, and illustrations. London: Murray, 1891. Pp. 488, 8vo, 18s.

Buckley, Arabella B. Moral Teachings of Science. London: Stanford, 1891. Pp. 116, p. 8vo, 3s.

Buhr, Gust. Gedanken eines arbeiters über Gott und Welt. Mit einem Vorwort von Prof. Dr. Theodor Ziegler. (Gegen den Materialismus. Gemeinfassliche Flugschriften.) Stuttgart: Krabbe (1891), 1892. Pp. 31, 8vo, 75 pf.

Buron, L. L. Vieilles églises de France. Paris: Delagrave, 1891. Pp. 223, sm. 4to, 2 fr.

Carriere, Moritz, Prof. Materialismus und Aesthetik. Eine Streitschrift zur Verständigung. (Gegen den Materialismus. Gemeinfasslich Flugschriften.) Stuttgart: Krabbe [1891], 1892. Pp. 31, 8vo, 75 pf.

Cassel, Paulus, Dr. Das Buch Esther. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Morgenlandes. Aus dem Hebräisch übersetzt, historisch und theologisch erläutert. 1. Abtheilung. Im Anhang: Die Uebersetzung des 2. Targum. Berlin: Bibliogr. Bureau, 1891. Neue Ausgabe. Pp. xxiv., 307, 8vo, 4 mk.

Caucasian. (Pseud.) Anthropology for the People: a refutation of the theory of the Adamic origin of all races. Richmond: Waddey Co., 1891. Pp. 334, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Chroust, A. Tageno. Ausbert, und die Historia peregrinorum. Drei Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Krezzuges Friedrichs I. Graz, 1891. Pp. viii., 205, 8vo, 5 mk.

Church, A. J. Stories from the Bible. Second series, with illustrations after Julius Schnorr. London: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 260, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Church and Her Doctrine. By the Bishop of Derry, Revs. C. H. Waller, Edward Hoare, R. B. Girdlestone, Sir Emilius Bailey, the Bishop of Ossory, Rev. H. C. G. Moule, Rev. Henry Wace. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 316, p. 8vo, 6s.

Clark, H. W. A History of Tithes. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 288, p. 8vo, 6s.

Comper, J. A Popular Handbook on the Origin, History, and Structures of Liturgies. Part I. Edinburgh: Grant, 1891. Pp. 162, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Concilio III., El, de Toledo, base de la nacionaledad y civilizacion española. Madrid: 1891. Pp. cxii., 376, 4to. (24 mk.)

Cornelius, C. A. Kristna Kyrkans historia. VII Delen. Stockholm: 1891. Pp. xxiii., 175, 8vo. (4.10 mk.)

Corsant, L. de. Louis Windthorst en Allemagne et le rôle du clerge en France. Paris: 1891. Pp. 80, 18mo, 1 fr.

Costa-Rosette, J. Die staatslehre der christlichen Philosophie. Fulda: Drackerei, 1891. Pp. iii., 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Crosby, Howard, D.D. Sermons. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. iii., 247, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Dale, R. W., D.D., LL.D. (ed.). The International Congregational Council, London, 1891. Authorized record of proceedings. With an introduction. London: Clarke, 1891. Pp. xxxiii., 418, 8vo.

Dalton, Hermann. Die russische Kirche. Eine Studie. Leipzig: Duncker, [1891] 1892. Pp. 84, 8vo, 2 mk.

Davidson, Thain, D.D. Brave and True: Talks to Young Men. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 117, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Delarc, O. Saint Grégoire VII. et la réforme de l'Eglise au xie siècle. Tom. 3 et dernier. Paris: Retaux-Bray, 1891. Pp. 643, 8vo.

Denkinger, H. Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, archevêque de Vienne 460–526 et la destruction de l'arianisme en Gaule. Thèse. Genève: George, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo, 1.50 fr.

Dieffenbach, G. Chr., Dr. Das Evangelium St. Lucä, in 204 kurzen Betrachtungen fur die Gemeinde ausgelegt. Stuttgart: Greiner, 1891. Pp. viii., 506, 8vo, 4.80 mk.

Dijkstra, H. Het Evangelie in onze Oost. Deel I. Leiden, 1891. Pp. iv., 212, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Dods, Marcus, D.D. Erasmus, and Other Essays. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 370, p. 8vo, 5s.

Döllinger, J. J. I. von. Das Papsthum Neubearbeitung von Janus 'Der Papst und das Concil' im Auftrag des inzwischen heimgegangenen Verfassers von J. Friedrich. München: Beck, 1891. Pp. xix., 579, 8vo, 8 mk.

Douglas. R. Darkest Britain's Epiphany. London: 1891. Pp. 346, 8vo, 6s.

Duff, David, D.D., LL.D. The Early Church: a history of Christianity in the first six centuries. Edited by his son, David Duff, M.A., B.D. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. 623, 8vo, $4.50.

Duncker, H. Anhalts Bekenntnisstand während der Vereinigung der Fürstentümer under Joachim Ernst und Johann George (1570–1606). Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Kirchengeschichte aus ungedruchten Quellen des Zerbster Haus- und Staatsarchios. Dessau: Baumann, 1891. Pp. v., 256, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Dunkley, C., Rev. (ed.) Official Report of the Church Congress held at Rhyl. Oct., 6th–9th, 1891. London: Bemrose, 1891. Pp. 440, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Dyer, T. F. T. Church-Lore Gleanings. London: Innes, 1891. Pp. 342, p. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Edwards, Amelia B. Pharaohs, Fellahs, and Explorers. Illustrated. London: Osgood, 1891. Pp. 320, 8vo, 18s.

Erichson, A. Martin Butzer, der elsässische Reformator. Zu dessen 400 jährigen Geburtsfeier den elsässischen Protestanten gewidmet. Strassburg, i.e.: Heitz, 1891. Pp. vi., 76, 8vo, 40 pf.

Euting, J. Sinaïtische Inschriften. Berlin: Reimer, 1891. Pp. xii., 92, mit 40 Tafeln. 4to, 24 mk.

Fannius, Cajus. (Pseud. ?) Die Quintessence des Modernen Jesuitismus. Zürich: Verlags-Magazin, 1891. Pp. iv., 114, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Farrar, F. W. Social and Present-Day Questions. London: Hodder; Boston: Bradley, 1891. Pp. ii., 377, 8vo, cloth, $2 00.

Farrar, J. A. Paganism and Christianity. London: Black, 1891. Pp. 268, p. 8vo, 6s.

Feer, Léon. Études Bouddhiques. Le Sûtra d'Upâi (Upâli Suttam). Paris: Maisonneuve, 1891. Pp. 136, 8vo.

Fillion, L. Cl. La Sainte Bible (text Latin et traduction française), commentée d'après la Vulgate et les textes originaux. Tome 3 (I. et II.: Paralipomenes, Esdras, Néhémias, Tobie, Judith, Esther, Job). Paris: Letouzey, 1891. Pp. 639, 8vo.

Finck, Franz Nik. Die Grundlage für eine neue Rangordnung der Werte. Ein Beitrag zur wissenschaftlichen Begründung einer erneuten und neuen Moral. München: Staegmeyr, 1891. Pp. 51, 8vo, 1 mk.

Fitzroy, A. I. Dogma and the Church of England. London: Blackwood, 1891. Pp. 290, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Flssch, F. M. Constantin der Grosse als erster christlicher Kaiser. Würzberg: Bucher, 1891. Pp. iii., 159, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Foote, Henry Wilder. Thy Kingdom Come. Ten Sermons on the Lord's Prayer. Preached in King's Chapel, Boston. Boston: Roberts, 1891. Pp. iv., 232, 12mo, $1.00.

Frank, F. H. R. Dogmatische Studien. Leipzig: Deichert, 1891. Pp. iv., 135, 8vo, 2 mk.

Franz, Heinrich. Peter von Amiens, Ein Bild aus dem ersten Kreuzzuge Programm. Hofgeismar, 1891. Pp. 6, 4to.

Friedländer, M. The Jewish Religion. London: Paul, 1891. Pp. 522, p. 8vo, 5s.

Fullerton, W. Y. Gospel Pictures in Bible Stories. Addresses Spoken and Unspoken. London: Passmore, 1891. Pp. 122, 12mo, 1s. 6d.

Furrer, K. Das Glaubensbekenntniss der abendländischen Kirchen, genannt das apostolische Symbolum. Nach seiner bleibenden Bedentung betrachtet. St. Gallen: Huber, 1891. Pp. iii., 40, 8vo, 60 pf.

Gailhard, G. Darwinisme et Spiritualisme. Paris: Perrin, 1891. Pp. 367, 18mo.

Gallo, C. A. Antropologia psichica. Terranova, Sicilia, 1891. Pp. 368, 16mo, (2 mk.)

Gallwitz, H. Das Problem der Ethik in der Gegenwart. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung desselben, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891. Pp. viii., 272, 8vo, 5 mk.

Gant, F. J. The Lord of Humanity; or, the Testimony of Human Consciousness. With supplement on the "Mystery of Suffering." 2d ed. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 162, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Gess, W. Fr. Die Inspiration der Helden der Bibel und der Schriften der Bibel. Basel: Reich, 1892. Pp. xx., 438, 8vo, 7 mk.

Gough, E. The Bible True from the Beginning. Vol. V. London: Paul, 1891. 8vo, 16s.

Grimke, Archibald H., M.A. William Lloyd Garrison. The Abolitionist. New York: Funk, 1891. Pp. ix., 405, 12mo, $1.50.

Hamlin, Tennis D., Rev., D.D. Denominationalism versus Christian Union. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 110, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Hammerstein, L. v. Gottes-Beweise. Eine Ergänzung zu "Edgar oder Vom Atheismus zur vollen Wahrheit." Trier: Paulinus, 1891. Pp. viii., 253, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Hanak. Die Heilswahrheiten des Christenthums. Ein vademecum fur Herrn Prof. Luthardt. Leipzig: Wigand, 1891. Pp. 148, 8vo, 2 mk.

Hansson, Ola. Der Materialismus in der Litteratur. (Gegen den Materialismus. Gemeinfassliche Flugshriften). Stuttgart: Krabbe (1891), 1892. Pp. 35, 8vo, 75 pf.

Harrison, Alex., J., B.D. Problems of Christianity and Scepticism. (See Bibliography for Dec., 1891.) New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. xvii., 340, 12mo, $2 25.

Hase, K. von. Annalen meines Lebens Herausgegeben von K. A. von Hase. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1891. Pp. vi., 356, 8vo, 6 mk.

Headley, P. C., Rev. God and Home and Native Land. A crown of the world's choicest gems, in prose and verse, illustrating the glory and love of our Heavenly Father, the charm and influences of home, and the greatness and beauty of our native land. With an introduction by Frances E. Willard. Boston: East Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. 562, 8vo.

Hillebrandt, A. Vedische Mythologie. 1. Band. Soma und verwandte götter. Breslau: Koebner, 1891. Pp. x., 547, 8vo, 24 mk.

Homélie de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze sur les Machabées. Edition classique, publiée avec un argument et des notes en français par E. Sommer. Paris: Hachette, 1891. Pp. 24, 12mo, 40 cts.

Horovitz, M. Theologische Abhandlungen und Responsen. (In hebraische Sprache). Frankfurt a.M.: Kauffmann, 1891. Pp. iii., 68, 4to, 3 mk.

Houghton, C. A. Life and Revelation. (Sermons.) Salisbury: Brown (London: Simpkin), 1891. Pp. 178, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Houghton, Louise Seymour. The Cruise of the Mystery in McAll Mission Work. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1891. Pp. 410, 12mo, $1.25.

Hughes, N. Collin, Rev., D.D. Genesis and Geology. The Harmony of the Scriptural and Geological Records. Chocowinity, N. C.: the author, 1891. Pp. vii., 142, 12mo.

Hunolt, Francis, Rev. The Good Christian: sermons from the German, being v. 7 and 8 of Hunolt's sermons. New York: Benziger, 1891. 2 vols, 8vo, cloth, $5.00.

Ingram, William Clavell, Rev., M.A. Happiness in the spiritual Life. (See bibliography for Dec., 1891.) New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. viii., 347, 12mo, $2.25.

Issel, E. Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes im Neuen Testament. Eine von der Haager Gesellschaft zur Verteidigung der christliche Religion gekrönte Preisschrift. Leiden: Brill, 1891. Pp. viii., 191, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Jellinek, Adam. Dr. Mate Aharon! Fünf Reden über das israelitische Glaubensbekenntniss. Hebräisch über setzt von Prediger Dr. S. Gelbhaus. Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. 34, 8vo, 1 mk.

Jensen, P. J. Om Kristi Praediken for Aanderne. 1 Petr. iii., 18-22 i ny Belysning. Kjobenhavn: Frimodt, 1891. Pp. 30, 8vo, 45 öre.

Jones, L. Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen. Edited by William Cairns Jones, with two portraits and a facsimile. Vol. I. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 222, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Kaatz, Hugo, Dr. Die Weltanschanung Friedrich Nietzsches. 1. Theil. Cultur und Moral. Dresden: Pierson, 1892. Pp xi., 127, 8vo, 2 mk.

Kähler, M. Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus. Vortrag. Leipzig: Deichert, 1891. Pp. 48, 8vo, 75 pf.

Kalischer, E. Parabel und Fabel bei den alten Hebräern. Inaugural-Dissertation der Universität Erlangen. Berlin: 1891. Pp. 42, 8vo.

Kambli, C. W. Gottfried Keller nach seiner Stellung zu Religion und Christenthum, Kirche, Theologie, und Geistlichkeit. St. Gallen: Hasselbrink, 1891. Pp. iv., 402, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Kattenbusch, Ferdinand, Prof., Dr. Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessions kunde. 2. Lieferung. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. 193-352, 8vo, 3 40 mk. (Lieferungen 1. & 2., 7 mk.)

Kaweran, G. Das Verhalten der römischen und der evangelischen Kirche zum Staat. Vortrag. Leipzig: Braun, 1891. Pp. 28, 8vo, 25 pf.

Keeling, Annie E. Heroines of Faith and Charity. London: Kelly, 1891. Pp. 276, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d. (Eleven short biographies, including St. Augustine's mother, Lady Jane Grey, Mary Carpenter, and Elizabeth Fry.)

Keibel, M. Die Religion und ihr Recht gegenüber dem modernen Moralismus Darstellung und Kritik der "ethischen Bewegung" unserer Zeit. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1891. Pp. viii., 85, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Kipper, Paul, Dr. Abbruch und Aufbau. Beiträge zur Kommenden Reformation. Berlin: Wilhelmi, 1891. Pp. viii., 60, 8vo, 1 mk.

Kirejew, A. A. Zur Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes. Aus dem Briefwechsel eines Katholischen Gelehrten mit einem russischen General. Leipzig: Slavische Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. xi., 71, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Kirkpatrick, A. F. The Divine Library of the Old Testament: its origin, preservation, inspiration, and permanent Value. Five Lectures. London: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 168, p. 8vo, 3s.

Kitchin, W. C. The Story of Sodom. A Biblical Episode. Illustrated by W. P. Snyder. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. 285, 12mo, $1.50.

Kneer, A. Kardinal Zabarella (Franciscus de Zabarellis, Cardinalis Florentinus) 1360-1417. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schismas. 1. Theil. Münster, i. W.: Theissing, 1891. Pp. viii., 63, 8vo. 1 mk.

Knox-Little, W. J. The Christian Home: its Foundation and Duties. 2d ed. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 280, p. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Koeberlin, K. Eine Würzburger Evangelienhandschrift. Inaugural-Dissertation. Augsburg, 1891. Pp. 96, 8vo.

Koehler, P. Entwurf einer Agende. II. Evangelisches Missale. Halle a. S.: Strien, 1891. Pp. x., 519, 8vo. (I. und II., 14.75 mk.)

Kohler, J., Prof. und Peiser, F. E. Aus dem babylonischen Rechtsleben. II. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo, 5 mk. (I. und II., 7 mk.)

Kuhn, Adolf. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Seleukiden vom Tode Antiochus' II. Sidetes bis auf Antiochus XIII, Asiatikos. Altkirch i. E. (Leipzig: Fock), 1891. Pp. 49, 4to, $1.20.

Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testamentes, sowie zu den Apokryphen. Herausgegeben von H. Strack und O. Zöckler. Altes Testament. 4. Abtheilung. (Inhalt Die Propheten Jesaia und Jeremia, ausgelegt von C. von Orelli.) München: Beck, 1891. Pp. x., 240, 8vo, 5.50 mk.

Lagarde, Paul de. Altes und Neues über das Weihnachtsfest. Mit einem Anhang. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1891. Pp. 211-323 und 384-428, 8vo, 2 mk.

Lassere, S. Étude sur le livre de Zakarie. Thèse. Montauban: Granié, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo.

Le Camus, Abbé. La Théologie populaire de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ. Conférences. Paris: Levé, 1891. Pp. vii., 228, 18mo.

Leffingwell, C. W. (ed.). Lyrics of the Living Church: original poems, compiled from "The Living Church." Chicago: McClurg, 1891. Pp. v., 275, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Loisy, A. Histoire du canon du nouveau Testament. Paris, 1891. Pp. 305, 8vo, 15 fr.

Lorinser, Franz, Dr. Aus meinem Leben. Wahrheit und Keine Dichtung. 2. Bände. Regensburg: Verlags-Anstalt (1891), 1892. Pp. iii., 403; iii., 561, 8vo, 4 mk.

Macgregor, James, Rev., D.D. The Apology of the Christian Religion. Historically regarded with reference to Supernatural Revelation and Redemption. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. 544, 8vo, $3.75.

Maclaren, Alexander, D.D. The Conquering Christ and other Sermons. New York: Dutton, 1891. Pp. vii., 302, 12mo, $1.25. (Also) The God of the Amen, and other sermons. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 344, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Majer, F. Die Evangelische Diaspora, ihre Leiden und ihre Freuden. Stuttgart: Evang. Gesellsch., 1891. Pp. 132, 8vo, 1 mk.

Malot, H. Conscience. Translated from the French by Julia S. Rae. 2 vols. London: Bentley, 1891. Cr. 8vo, 21s.

Manitius, M. Geschichte der christlichen lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1891. Pp. x., 518, 8vo, 12 mk.

Marston, Annie W. Joined to the Lord: Thoughts on the Song of Solomon. With preface by Dr. Elder Cumming. London: Marshal, 1891. Pp. 172, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Maspero, G. Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria. With 182 illustrations. London: Chapman, 1891. Pp. 376, p. 8vo, 5s.

Matzen, H., og Timnk, J. Haandbog i den danske Kirkeret. 7. og 8. Heft. Kjobenhavn, 1891. Pp. 96, 8vo, (2.25 mk.)

Meyer, F. B. The Life and Light of Men: Expositions of John i.-xii. London: Morgan, 1891. Pp. 250, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Michael, C. D. The Slave and his Champions: Granville Sharp, Thomas Clarkson, W. Wilberforce and Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton. London: Partridge, 1891. Pp. 160, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Michel. Die Kirche Christi und die christlichen Gemeinden. Zürich: Höhr, 1891. Pp. vi., 38, 8vo, 90 pf.

Miller, J. R., D.D. The Dew of thy Youth. An Address to Young People of the Society of Christian Endeavor. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 29, 16mo, 20 cts.

Miller, William, Rev. The Transfigured Valley. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. iv., 159, 16mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Miller, William Haig. The Great Rest-giver. With portrait of author. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 224, 12mo, $1.00.

Monteiro, Rose. Delagoa Bay: its Natives and Natural History. With 20 illustrations. London: Philip, 1891. Pp. 274, p. 8vo, 9s.

Mühe, Ernst. Prophetische Epistelpredigten über Seitenstücke zu den Episteln aus den Propheten und den Lehrbüchern des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: Böhme, 1891. Pp. xiii., 446, 8vo, 5 mk.

Muir, P. McA. The Church of Scotland: a sketch of its history. New ed., with notes and index. Edinburgh: Black, 1891. Pp. 230, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Müller, Karl. Die göttliche Zuvorersehung und Erwählung in ihrer Bedeutung für den Heilstand des Einzelnen Gläubigen nach dem Evangelium des Paulus. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung. Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1891. Pp. iv., 159, 8vo, 3 mk.

Nachmias, Jos., Rabbi. Commentar zum Buche Esther, zum ersten Male herausgegeben nach einer Handschrift der Königlichen Hof und Staatsbibliothek München mit Emendationen, Quellennachweisen und Anmerkungen von M. L. Bamberger. (Deutsch und hebräisch.) Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1891. Pp. 23, 31, 8vo, 2 mk.

Newton, Bp. A Guide to the Apocalypse: being an abridgment of Bishop Newton's celebrated work on the Revelation (1762). London: Kerby, 1891. Pp. 176, p. 8vo, 6s.

Oxenden, Ashton, Bp. The History of my Life: an autobiography. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 260, p. 8vo, 5s.

Parker, Joseph, D.D. People's Bible. Vol. xv. New York: Funk, 1891. Pp. iv., 460, 8vo, $1.50.

Paul, J., Pastor. Die Wahrheit des christlichen Bekenntnisses, beleuchtet aus Erlebnissen und Thatsachen der Erfahrung. Ein Fingerzeig fur Wahrheit Suchende. Berlin: Ev. Gesells., 1891. Pp. 62, 8vo, 50 pf.

Paulus, N. Der Augustiner mönch Johannes Hoffmeister. Ein Lebensbild aus der Reformationszeit. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. xx., 444, 8vo, 4 mk.

Peloubet, F. N., Rev., D.D. Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. With golden texts and Bible facts. Arranged. Boston: Wilde, 1891. Pp. 32, 18mo. (Also) The International Question Book and scholars' aid on the uniform series of the Sabbath-School Lessons. Adopted by the International Committee for 1892. In three grades. Grade I., Senior. Pp. 200. Grade II., Intermediate. Part III., for younger scholars. Pp. 179. (Part III. is by Alice Norton. Pp. 204.) Boston: Wilde, 1891, 16mo.

Peloubet, F. N., Rev., D.D., and Peloubet, M. A. Select Notes. A commentary on the International Lessons for 1892. Explanatory, illustrative, doctrinal, and practical. With illustrations, maps, pictures, chronology of the Old Testament, chronology of the Acts, suggestions to teachers, library references. Studies in the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel; in the Psalms and in the Acts. Boston: Wilde, 1891. Pp. 360, 8vo.

Percival, Herbert, Mrs. Heroes of Modern Days. Illustrated. London: Gardner, 1891. Pp. 124, p. 8vo, 1s. (Contains lives of Frederic III., Daniel Macmillan, Bishop Hannington, Sir H. B. Edwardes, Edward Denison, Rev. Edward Thwing, Lord Shaftesbury.)

Peter, J. G. Le livre d'Henoch, ses idées messianiquesat son eschatologie. Thèse-Genève: Georg, 1890. Pp. 74, 8vo, 1.50 fr.

Petersen, F. Fritaenkerne og Kristen-Krones moralske vaerd. Christiania: 1891. Pp. 220, 8vo. (4.50 mk.)

Pierson, A. Studiën over Johannes Kalvijn. Deerde reeks (1540–1542). Amsterdam: Van Kampen. 1891. Pp. xxviii., 184, 8vo, 2.25 fl.

Pierson, Arthur T. The Divine Enterprise of Missions. A series of Lectures delivered at New Brunswick, N. J., before the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America upon "Graves" foundation in the months of January and February, 1891. New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 1891. Pp. 333, 12mo, $1.25.

Prayers from the Poets. A list of supplicatory poems, compiled by M. H., and selected with the permission of the various publishers. New York & Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 199, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Prentiss, George L. The Agreement between Union Seminary and the General Assembly. A chapter supplementary to "Fifty Years of the Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York." New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. iv., 144, 8vo, 50 cts.

Rappenhöner, Jos., Prof., Dr. Allgemeine Moraltheologie. 1. Theil.: Die Lehre über Freiheit, Gesetz, Gewissen. Münster i. W.: Aschendorf, 1891. Pp. 188, 8vo, 2.75 mk.

Remondino, P. C., M.D. History of Circumcision; from the earliest times to the present: moral and physical reasons for its performance; with a history of eunuchism, hermaphroditism, etc. Philadelphia: Davis, 1891. Pp. ix., 346, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Robertson, J. Corn on the Mountains: Sermons. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 300, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Robins, H. E. Great Questions of the Day: Is there probation after death? Is there hope for the heathen? Can infants be saved? etc. The harmony of ethics with theology. An essay in revision. London: Morgan, 1891. Pp. 86, p. 8vo, 1s.

Röhrich, A. Essai sur Saint Jérome Exégète. Thèse. Geneve: Georg, 1891. Pp. 72, 8vo, 1.50 fr.

Robinson, J. A. Texts and Studies. Contributions to biblical and patristic literature. Cambridge: Un. Pr., 1891. No. 2. The Passion of St. Perpetua, newly edited from the MSS., with an introduction and notes. together with an appendix containing the original Latin text of the Scillitan Martyrdom, by J. A. Robinson. Pp. x., 132. No. 3. The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church, by F. H. Chase. Pp. xii., 181.

Roger, Freddi, Père. Jésus-Christ Verbe incarné. Considérations tirées des œuvres du docteur angélique saint Thomas d'Aquin. Traduites de l' Italien par le Père Le Chauff de Kerguenec. Poitiers: Oudin, 1891. Pp. x, 452, 18mo, 2.50 fr.

Romeyn, P. Drie forsche Karakters. Jeremia de profeet—Phocion—Cato van Utica. Leiden: Van Doesburgh, 1891. Pp. 117, 8vo, 1.25 fl.

Ryssel, V. Georgs des Araberbischofs Gedichte und Briefe. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt und erläutert. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1891. Pp. xx., 240, 8vo, 7 mk.

Saint-Martin, Ludwig von. Sein Leben und seine theosophischen Werke in geordnetem Auszuge. Durch Johannes Claassen. Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1891. Pp. 453, 8vo, 5 mk.

Schaefer, Aloys, Prof., Dr. Die Bücher des Neuen Testamentes, erklärt. 3. Band. (Inhalt.: Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer.) Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1891. Pp. xii., 420, 8vo, 6.50 mk. (Bände 1. und 3. 12 mk.)

Schlosser, Gust., Pfarrer. Das Alte Testament, in Predigten und Bibelstunden ausgelegt. Nach seinem Heimgang herausgegeben von Pfarrer Otto Scriba. 1. Daserste Buch Mose. Mit Vorwort von Dr. Hesekiel. Bielefeld: Velhagen (1891), 1892. Pp. vi., 370, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Schmidt-Warneck, Prof., Dr. Die socialen Verhältnisse und die ethischen Grundgedanken des Evangeliums. Referat auf dem Jahrestage der Freunde und Diener der braunschweigischen Landeskirche am 1. Juli, 1891. Braunschweig: Grüneberg, 1891. Pp. 59, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Schmiedel, O. Kultur-und Missionsbilder aus Japan. 2. Flugschrift des Allgemeinen Evangelisch-protestantischen Missions-Vereins. Berlin: Haack, 1891. Pp. 48, 8vo, 50 pf.

Schmoller, O. Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Bearbeitung einer von der Haager Gesellschaft zur Verteidigung der christlichen Religion Gestellten Aufgabe. Leiden: Brill, 1891. Pp. vii., 219, 8vo. (3.50 mk.)

Schultze, V. Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidentums. II. Die Ausgänge. Jena: Costenoble, 1891. Pp. ix., 240, 8vo, 7 mk.

Sermon Bible. John iv.-Acts vi. London: Hodder (New York: Armstrong), 1891. Pp. 396, 8vo, 7s. 6d.; $1.50.

Sermons on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. By the Monday Club. Seventeenth series. Boston and Chicago: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 404, 12mo, $1.25.

Servet's, M., Wiederherstellung des Christentums. 1. Band. 7 Bücher über die Dreieinigkeit, zum erstenmal übersetzt von B. Spiess. Wiesbaden: Limbarth, 1892. Pp. 323, 8vo, 5 mk.

Sharr, F. J. The Inspiration of Holy Scriptures: being the twenty-first Fernley Lecture, delivered in Nottingham, July 31, 1891. London: Wesl. Conf. Off., 1891. Pp. 180, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Spurgeon, Charles H., Rev. All of Grace. An earnest word with those who are seeking salvation by the Lord Jesus Christ. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 128, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Stalker, James, D.D. The Preacher and his Models: the Yale lectures on preaching, 1891. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. ix., 284, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Stalker, James, D.D. Temptation. A talk to young men. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 31, 16mo, 20 cts.

Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn, D D. Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey. Illustrated edition. Vol. I. The Foundation of the Abbey—The Coronation—The Royal Tombs—The Monuments. Vol. II. The Monuments (continued) before and since the Reformation. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. xliii., 335; ix., 422, 8vo, $7.50.

Steele, George M., D.D., LL.D. Rudimentary Ethics. A text-book for high schools and academies. Boston and New York: Leach, 1891. Pp. xiv., 227, 12mo, $1.00.

Stewart, H. F. Boethius: an essay. London: Blackwood, 1891. Pp. 274, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d. (A development of the Hulsean Prize Essay at Cambridge, 1888.)

Stock, S. G. Windows: or, Gospel Light for Gospel Subjects. Suggestions for addresses and lessons on Scripture emblems. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 130, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Stokes, G. G., Prof., Sir. Natural Theology. The Gifford Lectures. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. viii., 272, 12mo, $1.50.

Stone, E. A., Rev., D.D. The Abiding Comforter. A series of Bible studies on the Person, the Presence, and the Power of the Holy Spirit. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 203, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Strecker, Wilhelm. Welt und Menschheit vom Standpunkte des Materialismus, Eine Darlegung der materialistischen Weltanschauung. Nebst eine "Einführung" von Prof. Dr. Ludwig Büchner. Leipzig: Spohr (1891), 1892. Pp. xv., 293, 8vo, 3 mk.

Stubbs, C. W. God and the People: the religious creed of a democrat. Being selections from the writings of Joseph Mazzini. London: Unwin, 1891. Pp. 172, 8vo, 5s.

Stubenvoll, Heidenthum im Christenthum. Heidelberg: Siebert, 1891. Pp. 192, 8vo, 2.90 mk.

Taylor, William M., D.D., LL.D. Ruth the Gleaner, and Esther the Queen. New York: Harper, 1891. Pp. 269, 12mo, $1.50.

Thayer, E. W., Rev. Sketches from the Life of Jesus. Historical and doctrinal. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. viii., 548, 8vo.

Theiner, J. A. und A. Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den christlichen Geistlichen und ihre Folgen. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschechte. Bevorwortet von F. Nippold (in 16 Lieferungen). 1. Lieferung. Barmen: Klein, 1891. Pp. 64, 8vo, 75 pf.

Treppner, M. Das Patriarchat von Antiochen von seinem Enstehen bis zum Ephesinum 431. Eine historisch-geographische Studie. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1891. Pp. xii., 252, 8vo, 4 mk.

Volkelt, Johannes, Prof. Vorträge zur Einführung in die Philosophie der Gegenwart. München: Beck, 1891. Pp. viii., 230, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Waldorff, F. Die lutherische Kirche im Kampfe mit Panslavismus und "Orthodoxie." (Zeitfragen des christlichen Volkslebens, 118. Heft. (XVI. Band., 6. Heft.) Stuttgart: Belfer, 1891 Pp. 56, 8vo, 1 mk.

Walls, Alfred, Rev. The Oldest Drama in the World, the Book of Job. Arranged in dramatic form with elucidations. With a prefatory note by Henry A. Butts, D.D. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. 124, 12mo, 60 cts.

Weatherley, L. A. The Supernatural? With chapter on Oriental Magic, Spiritualism, and Theosophy. Bristol: Arrowsmith (London: Simpkin), 1891. Pp. 284, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

White, Edward, Archbp. of Canterbury. Living Theology. London: Low; New York: Dutton, 1891. Pp. 225, 12mo, 3s. 6d.; $1.25.

White, H., Rev. Echoes from a Sanctuary. Edited and arranged by Sarah Doudney, with an introduction by the Bishop of Ripon. London: Hutchinson, 1891. Pp. 180, p. 8vo, 5s.

Wichelhaus, Johannes, Prof. Mittheilungen aus den Vorlesungen über das Alte Testament. Herausgegeben von Dr. Adolf Zahn. 1. und 2. Hefte. (Inhalt. 1. Aus den Psalmen. 2. Aus Mose und den Propheten.) Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1891. Pp. 163, 99, 8vo, 1.60 mk. 1. mk.

Wichner, J. Kloster Admont und seine Beziehungen zur Wissenschaft und zum Unterricht. Nach archivalischen Quellen. Graz: 1891. Pp. 216, 8vo, 4 mk.

Wilhelmi, R. Der sittliche Mensch, aus seinem psychologischen Gesetz entwickelt. Eine gemeinverständliche Darstellung. Leipzig: Wigand, 1891 Pp. 126, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Wilpert, J. Ein Cyclus christologischer Gemälde aus der Katakombe des Heiligen Petrus und Marcellinus. Zum erstemal herausgegeben und erläutert. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. vii., 58, fo. 8 mk.

Wingate, F. R. Mahdiism and the Egyptian Sudan (see Bibliography for December). New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. xxviii., 617, 8vo, cloth, $10.00.

Wise, Daniel, D.D. Faith, Hope, Love, and Duty. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. xi., 305, 12mo, $1.00.

Xenia Bernardina S. Bernardi primi abbatis Claravallensis octavos natales sæculares pia mente celebrantes ediderunt antistites et conventus Cistercienses provinciæ Austriaco-Hungaricæ. Pars I.: Sermones S. Bernardi de Tempore, de Sanctis, de Diversis 2 Bände. Pars II.: Handschriftenverzeichniss der Cistercienserstifte der österreichischungarischen Ordensprovinz. 2 Bände. Pars III.: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Cistercienserstifte der öster.-ung. Ordensprovinz. 5 Bände. Wien: Hölder, 1891. Pp. xxxi, 1140; viii., 561; 511; viii., 428, 8vo.

Zezschwitz, Gerhard von, Prof. Der Hirt und seine Herde. Predigten, gehalten in der Universitätskirche zu

Erlangen (in den Jahren 1868–1884). Zusammengestellt zu einem Jahrgang und herausgegeben von Pfarrer Gerhard von Zezschwitz. Erlangen : Merkel, 1891. Pp. xii., 587, 8vo, 6 mk.

Zimmer, Frdr., Prof., Dr. Denkschrift des königlichen preussischen evangelisch-theologischen Seminars zu Herborn, 1890–1891. Inhalt. 1. Theologische Kommentar zu den Thessalonicherbriefen. 2. Nachrichten über das Seminar. Herborn : Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. 128, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

CHRONICLE.

(*Closes on the 20th of each month.*)

Nov. 13. The London Baptist Social Union proposes that an international conference of Baptists shall be held in Chicago in 1893.

Nov. 15. The Chamber of Commerce at Glasgow disapproves of the practice of working cargoes on Sundays countenanced by English merchants in foreign ports, some of the Crown colonies, and the Anglo-Indian harbors.

Nov. 17–20. Fourteenth Episcopal Church Congress at Washington, D. C.

Nov. 20. Bishop Selwyn, of Milanesia, informed the Primate of New Zealand that he must resign his see on account of ill-health.

Dec. 13. Rev. Dr. Charles De Witt Bridgman, formerly of the Baptist Church, and Rev. H. O. Ladd, formerly of the Congregational Church, ordained by Bishop Potter, the former as deacon and the latter as priest.

Archbishop Kendrick, of St. Louis, has just celebrated his jubilee as a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church. It is said that no prelate in this country ever had this privilege before. It will be remembered that Dr. Kendrick was one of the two American bishops who voted against the dogma of Papal Infallibility in the Vatican Council.

Dec. 16–17. National Convention of the American Sabbath Union at Des Moines, Iowa.

The Rev. James F. Spalding, of Cambridge, Mass., one of the oldest Episcopal ministers in this country, announces his intention of joining the Roman Catholic as the "only true Church of Christ." He belongs to the High Church school.

The Rev. C. Kinloch Nelson, D.D., of Bethlehem, Pa., who was elected Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Georgia, has signified his acceptance, subject to the canonical conditions. The same Diocese had previously elected Dr. Thomas F. Gailor, of the University of the South, and the Rt. Rev. Ethelbert Talbot, Missionary Bishop of Idaho and Wyoming, but both had declined on the ground of pre-existing duty and obligation.

The Right Rev. John Wareing Bardsley, D.D., at present Bishop of Sodor and Man, has been appointed Bishop of Carlisle, to succeed the Right Rev. Harvey Goodwin, D.D., who died last month.

OBITUARY.

Dodwell, Rev. George B. (Church of England), rector of Wilmot, Nova Scotia; formerly professor of divinity in Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Province of Quebec, died at Halifax, November 2, 1891, aged 58.

King, Ven. Francis (Church of Ireland), D.D. (Trinity College, Dublin, 1879), archdeacon of Dromore, and the oldest priest of the Church of Ireland, died at Newry, Ireland.

Hill, Rev. Thomas (Unitarian), S.T.D. (Harvard, 1860), LL.D. (Yale, 1863), president of Harvard College. 1862–68; pastor at Portland, Me., from 1873 till his death at Waltham, Mass., Nov. 21, 1891, aged 73. He was a Unitarian of the early conservative school. He was very versatile, and loved to have others share his rich stores of scientific knowledge, while "his pure and elevated character, the simplicity of his habits, and his engaging manners strongly drew to him the love and respect of all who intimately knew him."

Goodwin, Rt. Rev. Harvey (Church of England), D.D. (Cambridge, 1858), lord bishop of Carlisle since 1869, died of heart trouble at Bishopthorpe, the residence of the archbishop of York, Nov. 25, 1891, aged 73. He is said to have been one of the first preachers of "muscular Christianity" and very popular with the workingmen, for whose especial benefit his commentaries on Matthew, Mark, and Luke were written (1857, 1860, 1865). He originated the idea of building a Church House as the Church of England's memorial of Queen Victoria's jubilee, and lived to see it finished.

Badley, B. H. (Methodist), D.D., principal of Lucknow Christian College, died at Lucknow, India, death intelligence received by cable in New York. Saturday, Nov. 28. He had been a missionary of rare efficiency since 1872.

Herrick, Rev. James (Congregationalist), missionary in Southern India, under the American Board, for 37 years, died at West Brattleboro, Vt., Nov. 30, 1891, aged 77.

Wadhams, Rt. Rev. Edgar Philip (Roman Catholic), bishop of Ogdensburgh, N. Y., Dec. 5, 1891, aged 74. He was graduated at Middlebury College and at the General Theological Seminary, and was till 1846 in the Episcopal Church. In that year he entered the Church of Rome, became in 1866 vicar-general of the diocese of Albany, in 1872 bishop of Ogdensburgh.

Galleher, Rt. Rev. John Nicholas (Episcopalian), S.T.D. (Columbia, 1875), bishop of Louisiana, died at New Orleans, Dec. 7, 1891, aged 53. He was in the Confederate army and not ordained priest till 1869. He became rector of Trinity Church in New Orleans, 1868, of the Memorial Church in Baltimore, 1871; of Zion Church in New York, 1873; bishop, 1880.

Browne, Rt. Rev. Edward Harold (Church of England), D.D. (Cambridge, 1864), D.C.L. (Oxford, 1877), lord bishop of Winchester (1873–90), died, Dec. 18, 1891, aged 80. After a distinguished career at Cambridge, both as undergraduate and as fellow and tutor, he became Norrisian professor of divinity there, 1854; bishop, N. Y., 1864; translated to Winchester, 1873. He was chairman of the Old Testament Company of Revisers. As an author he is best known by his "Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles," 1850–53, 2 vols.; 13th ed., 1887, 1 vol., and by his Commentary on Genesis in the "Speaker's Commentary." He took great interest in the Old Catholic movement.

Beardsley, Rev. Eben Edwards, D.D., LL.D. (Episcopalian), rector of St. Thomas' Church, New Haven, Conn., died in that city Dec. 22, 1891. He was a graduate of Trinity College; was the author of "The History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut from the Settlement of the Colony to the Death of Bishop Brownell in 1865," and "Life and Correspondence of the Rt Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D., First Bishop of Connecticut and of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

Freppel, Rt. Rev. Charles Émile (Roman Catholic), Bishop of Angers, died at Paris, France, Dec. 22, 1891. He was, perhaps, the best-known clerical member of the Chamber of Deputies.

Constantine, Rev. George, D.D., a missionary under the American Board, died in Athens recently, where he was born Jan. 1, 1833. He was educated at Amherst College and Andover Theological Seminary; returned to Athens in 1862 as missionary of the American and Foreign Christian Union, and so remained till 1872, when the Union closed its work in Greece. From 1872 till 1880 he worked independently, supported by American friends. In 1881 he removed to Smyrna, worked under the American Board, and made such an impression that he was persecuted in 1886 by the bigoted city authorities. He was founder and president of the Greek Evangelical Alliance.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5. FEBRUARY, 1892. No. 5.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE MORAVIAN MISSION IN ALASKA.

BY THE REV. J. TAYLOR HAMILTON, PROFESSOR IN THE MORAVIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, BETHLEHEM, PA., AND ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE "MORAVIAN."

IMPERISHABLE as the amaranth, the results of Christian philanthropy often furnish a commentary from life on the saying of the ancient preacher, that bread "cast upon the waters" shall be found "after many days." Gloriously though they displayed the power of the Gospel to subdue the hearts of the fiercest of savages, the Moravian missions among the Indians during the last century were emphatically a sowing of seed on soil flooded by the waters of disaster. Commencing with the fruitful work of Christian Henry Rauch among the Mohicans of Shekomeko, in Dutchess County, N. Y., in 1740, and productive of flourishing villages of civilized Christian Delawares and Iroquois in Pennsylvania and Ohio, in spite of the sixty-two years of apostolic labor of David Zeisberger and the faithful and successful efforts of his numerous coadjutors, ruthless war, compulsory wanderings, and cruel massacre of "brown hearts," too Christian to bear arms in self-defence, reduced the Moravian Indians to a feeble remnant by the beginning of the present century. Although by the year 1809 between thirteen and fourteen hundred converts had been baptized, long before that date the decline had set in; and with but four stations to represent the once flourishing enterprise, by the time the centenary of the mission came round, short-sighted human judgment might very likely have pronounced it all "useless toil." Casting of "bread upon the waters," that it was; but would it be found again "after many days?" God knew.

Near where the Lehigh cleaves a narrow passage through those Blue Mountains which then formed the border of the Indian Country, three years before Rauch brought the Gospel to the tribes of New York, and four years before his fellow-Moravians colonized in the "Forks of the Delaware," there was born to the son of Netawatwes, head sachem of the Delawares, a child called by his people Gelelemend, that is Kilbuck. This child, who in time came to the headship of his nation, like his grandfather received baptism at the hands of a Moravian missionary, and remained a devoted, consistent Christian till his death at Goshen, in Ohio, in 1811.

A few families near Ottawa, Kan., are now the sole representatives of these Christianized Delawares within the limits of the United States; and yet, not absolutely the only remnant.

Away off in the semi-arctic regions of Alaska, Gelelemend's great-grandson, John Henry Kilbuck, a full-blooded descendant of a long line of chiefs, is heralding Christ with magnificent success to benighted Esquimaux, as an ordained minister of the Church which brought his ancestors under the power of the cross; and so it is, that bread "cast upon the waters" is being found "after many days."

The story of this mission, in which the descendant of Indian chiefs stands forth as the most prominent figure, is full of interest, and demonstrates anew that the only wise as well as only Christian policy for whites over against the aborigines of this and every other land, has a solution provided in the world-religion of Jesus Christ. Applied Christianity, such as Zeisberger and Heckewelder and their colleagues advocated more than a hundred years ago, if from the first adopted and consistently and steadfastly utilized by our nation, would not only have averted the shedding of much human blood, but with this would have prevented at least one of our national sins, and might have given the red race a glorious future. Fortunate it is that to day it is beginning to be more or less widely proclaimed, that the "good Indian" is the "Christianized Indian."

The commencement of the Moravian Mission in Alaska, in which John Henry Kilbuck seems destined to do an apostle's work, was entirely unforeseen by the members of that Church till within a year of its actual inception ; and the call came from an unexpected quarter.

Ever since the year 1787 there has existed at Bethlehem, Pa., the "Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen." At the annual meeting of this society, held on August 23, 1883, its President, the late Moravian Bishop Edmund de Schweinitz, communicated a letter from the Rev. Sheldon Jackson, D.D., then of the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, now Superintendent of Education in Alaska, in which he proposed to the Moravian Church the establishment of a mission among the Indians and Esquimaux of Alaska. He wrote that he had unsuccessfully applied to other denominations on behalf of the neglected heathen of the northwestern part of the Territory.

Dr. Jackson's appeal was favorably entertained, and erelong the directing board of the Moravian Church in America appointed the Rev. A. Hartmann, missionary among the Indians in Ontario, and Mr. William Weinland, a member of the graduating class of the Moravian Theological Seminary, at Bethlehem, to undertake a tour of exploration in the little-known western portion of Alaska.

Passage having been secured on the United States revenue cutter *Corwin*, various officials of the Marine Revenue Bureau and Coast Survey expressed their kindly interest, and intimated that the Government would welcome all information the explorers might be able to gather about the inhabitants, flora, fauna, and geological features of that portion of the Territory.

For while the financial wisdom of the purchase effected in 1867 had already been strikingly vindicated by the revenue derived from the monopoly of the catch of seals, the central and northern portions of Alaska remained in large measure a *terra incognita.*

Steaming out of San Francisco on May 3d, 1884, the *Corwin*, Lieutenant M. A. Healy commanding, reached Ounalaska on May 16th, and thence the explorers proceeded in the *Dora*, a steamer belonging to the Alaska Commercial Company, across Behring Sea to the mouth of the Nushagak River. Here a priest of the Greek Church was found, who claimed the district of the Nushagak and Togiak rivers as his parish ; hence they remained with the ship till she anchored at the mouth of the Kuskoquim River on June 12th.

Up this stream the explorers travelled for about one hundred and fifty miles in two large *bidarkas,* skin canoes, each seating three persons, being paddled by natives. Their interpreter was a Mr. Lind, an agent of the Alaska Commercial Company of San Francisco.

Through the mediation of Mr. Lind the natives were found to be disposed to friendly intercourse and approachable, and on the whole honest, having very few possessions to tempt cupidity or prompt to theft, but very superstitious, very filthy, very loose in their estimate of the marriage relation, and living in complete disregard of the most ordinary laws of health, so that lung diseases and scrofulous affections appeared to be very common. Good-natured and smiling, in the midst of their degradation, they at no time inspired the strangers with a sense of insecurity.

As for the land, it was flat, sandy soil, frozen at the depth of a few feet below the surface, and was covered with *tundra*, a mossy, peaty growth. Considerable timber of slight thickness was met with on the numerous islands. Berries were more or less plentiful. In the distance mountains, wooded on their lower slopes, rose to a respectable height. Indications of great forests along the southern reaches of the Kuskoquim, in the distant interior, were present in the driftwood lodged on the mudbanks and islands of the stream.

As a result of the report of these explorations, the spring of 1885 sees a company of missionary pioneers in San Francisco *en route* for Bethel, as the projected station about seventy-five miles up the Kuskoquim is to be named. They are the Revs. William H. Weinland and John Henry Kilbuck, recent graduates of the Moravian Theological Seminary, with their wives, and Hans Torgersen, a practical carpenter, who goes with them as a lay missionary to superintend the building of houses and assist in establishing the mission. He has left his wife at the Indian mission of his Church in Canada, where he has hitherto been engaged. On May 18th the *Lizzie Merrill*, a chartered schooner, weighs anchor and bears them to a field fitted for the display of the stanchest Christian heroism. After a tedious voyage anchor is dropped at the mouth of the Kuskoquim about the middle of June, and by the 19th all their goods have been transferred to shore in a small sailboat, the *Bethel Star*, with which the river is to be navigated. A native of Pennsylvania, a pure-blooded descendant of Delaware chiefs, and a Scandinavian, heralds of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to Esquimaux; so it is that the drawing power of the cross not only brings the nations of the world to own the sceptre of the one sovereign Lord, but levels also distinctions of race and in the truest sense makes all men kin.

Heartily welcomed and hospitably entertained by Mr. Lind, the missionaries began to provide permanent accommodations for themselves; but soon they were to be put to a severe test. On August 10th, while bringing from the mouth of the river a load of lumber, the most experienced man, Hans Torgersen, fell overboard and was drowned.

It would be difficult for those who have never known anything else than a comfortable home in a temperate climate, to realize the difficulty and the danger of the situation in which the two young men, with their brides of a few months, were thus placed. Face to face with an arctic winter, and without a roof over their heads, neither of them understood carpenters' tools, beyond having the very general knowledge of him who can tell a saw from a chisel and a hammer from a gimlet. The material they had brought for the construction of a house had been so thoroughly soaked by frequent rains, as to render it doubtful whether it could be used. Kilbuck was suffering from a painful climatic affection of the eyes. "Sign language" was the only medium of communication with the natives, except for the kindly aid of the trader. It might have been excusable, perhaps, had they beaten a retreat while it was possible. Not they.

Erecting a small dwelling according to the best of their ability, they took possession of it in the name of the Lord on October 10th; and none too soon, as life in tents had begun to be unendurable. If it is asked, what was the secret of their endurance during this time of severe test, this sentence from a letter sheds a bright light upon their humble toil, "You see that we can say, The Lord is our Helper."

The winter, which soon set in, was unusually severe, even for Alaska. In October neighboring lakes were like rock in the grasp of the cold, and it was the end of May before the river was open. Warm waves at intervals made the climate endurable, but at times it was very, very cold. On December 29th the thermometer registered $50\frac{6}{10}$° below zero. During such weather two fires had to be maintained night and day. One missionary was kept constantly employed securing wood for fuel; yet considerable study was given to the language of the Esquimaux, many of whose ailments were relieved by the medical skill of the missionaries and their wives; and religious services were statedly maintained. To begin a school was an impossibility this first season.

Meantime, at the solicitation of one of the five companies operating salmon-canneries at the mouth of the Nushagak River, the establishment of a second station there also was being considered, chiefly with a view to secure better communication with Bethel than that afforded by the solitary trips of the trading steamer twice in the summer to the Kuskokwim. Accordingly in the summer of 1886, the Rev. Frank Wolff, of Green Bay, Wis., who volunteered, securing in San Francisco prepared lumber, transported the materials for a dwelling-house and school to the Nushagak, and in thirteen days after landing had it completed, with the aid of the men of the company. On September 8th he locked the building, previous to setting out for home, and entrusted the key to the care of the native chief.

The missionary party destined for Carmel, as this second station was named, left San Francisco on May 10th following, and consisted of Mr. Wolff and his family, and Miss Mary Huber, a lady volunteer from Litiz, Lancaster County, Pa. Such had been the fidelity with which the native chief discharged his trust, that when they reached their destination, the mission-house, with everything it contained, was found untouched.

At Bethel the winter of 1886–87 had been a season of severe trial. School had been opened for native children on September 8th, 1886, and had been steadily maintained, as had also the Sabbath-school organized on the following Lord's Day; but severe lung troubles had incapacitated the missionary, Weinland, from active work. It was evident that the climate would prove fatal erelong if he remained, but in spite of this progress had been made. A second house had been built of logs rafted down the river. The native boys were manifesting surprising aptitude.

Usually the services were well attended by Esquimaux, several of whom expressed a desire to know more when the missionaries' tongues should become "light." The celebration of Christmas had made a sensation far and near. So Kilbuck and his wife were constrained to bravely hold on, when their only helpers, in shattered health, bade a sad farewell, in spite of the fact that no assistance could be expected till the following summer, owing to the impossibility of communication with the directing board at home.

A weary, weary time must the following winter have been to Kilbuck and his heroic wife. Work enough for half a dozen persons was on their hands. At times Esquimaux covered with boils, resulting from a period of semi-starvation, clamor for salves and medicines; school must be kept, the seventeen children thoroughly cleansed, even disinfected when first received, then clothed and fed; there is another log-house to be built with the aid of natives; heavy parental anxieties about their own little Katie depress them; the bitter cold must be endured, sometimes Kilbuck's lips and nose are frozen as he walks twenty-five or thirty miles to plan for the erection of chapels at two other villages; there are at times contests with the *shamans*, or witch-doctors; sometimes the utter cruelty of the heathen sickens the heart. Here are extracts from the missionary's journal during this period:

"Some one tied a helpless little child of about two years down to the water's edge at low tide. Its cries attracted the attention of a passer-by, who found the water already nearly up to his neck. The man took it to his home and took good care of it. It was recognized as a Neposkiogamute child, whose mother had died, the father leaving it in the care of an old woman at Mumtrekhlagamute. The child is sickly and doubtless was too much of a care for her. The only surprise that people have about it is, that any one should want to drown or kill a boy; their girls are often killed, but seldom a boy." . . . "At the mouth of the river, an old woman was cut up into small pieces by a man, who supposed he had lost his children through her witchery. Some time ago quite a prominent native brought an aunt down here. She was insane, and he was her only living relative. This man wished to leave her among strangers, and tried to bribe them to kill her. He was finally compelled to take her back to his home. We heard the other day that he deliberately froze her to death."

But when night is darkest day is at hand. Christmas has been a time of special interest. It is now the Holy Week. Daily services, such as are customary among Moravians, at which the Gospel narrative of the last days of the God-man upon earth is read, have been commenced on Palm Sunday.

Twice or even sometimes thrice a day there has been a willingness on the part of many Esquimaux to listen for an hour and a half to two hours at a time to the "old, old story." It is at length Good Friday. He has reached the crucifixion, and is explaining that the blood of Jesus Christ takes away the sin of the world, when some of the older men exclaim, "*Kou-já-nah!* (Thanks). *We, too, desire to have our badness taken away by that blood.*" It is Easter Sunday, at daybreak, and forty people have gathered about *the grave of the Missionary Torgersen*. They sing, in the native language, three hymns of the resurrection. The message, that He died for our sins and rose again for our justification, is precious to the hearts of Esquimaux, it appears, as well as to the Caucasians who sent the messenger and to the Indian messenger from whom they received the glad tidings. After a period of instruction and probation, on September 10th, 1888, eight are gathered into the Church of Christ as the first-fruits of the Moravian Mission in Alaska.

Help was sent to the Rev. Mr. Kilbuck as soon as possible after the situation was learned at home, in the person of the Rev. Ernest Weber, who volunteered and was ordained for service in this special field, and who arrived on June 16th, 1888. His impressions of the life of the natives are conveyed in the following graphic description of a "reception" tendered him by the natives of a village up the river. He says:

"In the evening the natives at this village had one of their dances for my especial benefit. It is more of a feast than anything else. They had a great many berries; and as they did not have any clean dishes for me, they turned my hat inside out and filled it up for me. It is surprising how many some of them can eat; often half a gallon of salmon-berries. They also had their ice-cream (of blubber), and sour fish-heads, and dry fish. They had two young women to dance. I wish I could make you understand how it was. First they get everything ready. They stretch a cord all full of dried birds across the room, and stick them up everywhere. Small birds are on the cord and large ones on the wall, such as large owls. Then the boys and young men all get down in the middle of the room with sticks in their hands. They have two tambourines to beat time on. Then the women come in, all arrayed in grand style. One had a sharpened stick through her nose, and was all covered with beads. Then the singing began. It seemed more like an Indian war-dance to me than anything else. The women would make all kinds of movements. They kept good time, and I must say it looked rather graceful. The boys keep time with their sticks. They do not strike anything, but just make motions. It lasted till about ten o'clock."

---

* It is a satisfaction to be able to add that the Rev. Mr. Weinland and his family gradually regained health on their return, in 1889, and were sent as missionaries to the Indians on the Banning Reserve in Southern California.

Mr. Weber is soon quite at home in his work. Early in December he takes Mr. Kilbuck's place as teacher in the school, that the latter may start off with dog-teams for a visit to Carmel, to confer with his brother missionary about their work. It is expected that this trip will require about thirty-five days, but the difficulties of travel are such that seventy-three days elapse before he reappears, like one risen from the dead, "his hair and beard long and his face all covered with black spots where it had been frozen." It had been almost a miracle that he got through with his life. Meantime his poor wife, worn-out with overwork and anxiety was confined for weeks to her bed, yet her noble faith shone clear and bright through all the trial.

What joy attended the return of the one considered lost! Says Mr. Weber in his diary for February 14th, 1889:

"When we least expect it the Lord answers our prayers. This morning, about eleven o'clock, we saw two large teams come around the island; but we had so completely given up Mr. Kilbuck that I did not think of him. When I saw them, some of the boys said, 'Who is that? Let's get the glass.' Pretty soon they said they believed it was Mr. Kilbuck. Then we all looked, but were afraid to say it was he, for fear we should be disappointed.

"Mr. Lind was here. He said it was he. Pretty soon he waved his hand, and then we knew it was he; and words cannot express the joy that we felt. Mr. Lind and I ran down to meet him. Mrs. Kilbuck and the children were standing by the house waiting. And it just seemed as if Mr. Kilbuck had risen from the dead. I do not believe we should have felt happier if he had."

Mr. Kilbuck's journey parallels the experiences of almost any of the most daring Arctic explorers. especially during the weeks of travel homeward. Fierce storms sometimes detained him in the native huts. Again the way led along the sea beach, and in the driving of the fine, flour-like snow it would have been easy to pass on to the uncertain ice, liable to drift out to sea, without realizing it in time. Elsewhere it was very difficult to tell whether a gentle slope or a precipitous descent lay ahead. At other points the party had to go zigzag up the mountains. This is the record of one day:

"Last Tuesday I left Togiak very early, but we could not travel very long on account of a heavy mist which prevented our guide from keeping the road; at least he advised that we had better camp before we should get lost. While the men were putting up the tent I found a few armfuls of dry (?) willow twigs with which we managed to boil water for tea. The night was cold, yet I slept very well. In the morning everything in the tent, like the tent roof, was covered with a thick coating of frost. We tried to boil water again, but had to give it up. All day it was cold. I had to take off my snow-shoes for a time to keep my toes from freezing. I almost cried with the pain when reaction set in, nor did I take off my snow-shoes any too soon. My men had the same experience."

His diary for January 30th, written in a native dug-out, reads thus:

"Well, here I am yet, and so is the storm, worse than ever. It is a regular 'Dakota blizzard.' One thing, it cannot hold out much longer. My bread and cracker supply is getting meagre. I still have, however, a good supply of tea and meat, which will last me until I get home. My greatest concern is about my poor dogs."

On Friday, February 1st, he writes:

"3 *o'clock* P.M.—I have just fed my dogs (first since Sunday) part of my deerskin bedding. It's poor food, but it's something in their empty stomachs at any rate. How much longer we are to be beleaguered by the storm king I have given up trying to guess. Every morning we say, 'To-morrow will be better,' but we learn that 'tomorrow' is never here."

On the fourth of the month one of the dogs made a meal of his harness and got away with the mittens of one of the Esquimaux. Thursday, February 7th, reads thus in his diary:

"Yesterday, although bitterly cold, I started out, against the opinions of the natives. The sky was beautifully clear, and there never was a calmer morning. It was cold, there was no doubt about that; but simple cold cannot stop me. Well, I started, and it was so cold that an empty sleigh with iron runners was a load, for the snow was like sand.

"'I was on the road about an hour, when my guide stopped and begged me to turn back. I asked for his reasons, upon which he informed me that a storm was approaching, and would be upon us before we could get to the warehouse, at the rate we were travelling. Oh! how I hated the idea of turning back, as the day still looked promising. When the guide saw that I was not fully convinced, he seemed to lose heart, and said, 'Well, we will go on if you say so; but I for one shall certainly freeze to death.' He then set to work to wrap himself up and prepared to go on. I could not but be touched by this, for he might have just simply said, 'You can go on, but I will return to the village.' In that case I could not have made him accompany us. Reluctantly, therefore, I returned to the village. Upon our arrival the people said, 'You did well to come back, for it is cold, and it is going to blow;' and they set to work to help get my bedding and box into the kashima, and to put up my sleigh. Sure enough, long before noon the wind came driving clouds of snow. The kashima, *i.e.*, common house for the men of a village, was so cold, although it had been just fiired up, that we all sat and huddled together in our parkas, *i. e.*, fur clothes, to keep warm. It had now been snowing so long that the natives have no wood, not enough to fire up the kashima decently. How I congratulate myself on having such a guide. Here I shall not suffer, nor my men, nor my dogs. The natives sat up nearly all night inside their parkas. I managed to sleep warmly, contrary to my expectation.

"The wind still howls, and it is cold. Hope I will get home before spring. The natives are busy making masks for their annual masquerade dance. To pass the time I have brought in the *Century Magazine*, and between reading it and talking with the natives, the time passes. I find that these people do not comprehend the simplest pictures. They were surprised when I explained to them that the print represented the conversation of some one. I told them that my journal was for you to read, and from it you would know about my entire trip, without my being present to tell you. I gave them a sample of what I had written, and you should have seen their faces covered with astonishment."

The happiness of the return was further enhanced by the reception, on the 24th of the month, of ten of the scholars and four adults into the Church.

The visit to Carmel had not only served to encourage the missionaries there to persevere in spite of all opposition on the part of the Greek priest, but also made it possible to send tidings to the directing board at a much earlier date than usual, through the kindness of Lord Lonsdale, who spent the Christmas season at Carmel at the close of an adventurous tour in arctic regions. From these letters it appeared as though the brave woman who had toiled so long at Bethel without female help might have to return home for a time. The news caused the volunteering of at least *nineteen* persons for missionary service in Alaska. Of these John Hermann Schoechert, of Watertown, Wis., was ordained and appointed to Carmel; and the daughter of a Moravian clergyman of Riverside, N. J., Miss Detterer, was selected for Carmel. In addition the wife of Bishop Henry T. Bachman, one of the Provincial Elders of the American Moravian Church, offered to go to Bethel for one year with her youngest son, so as to give Mrs. Kilbuck the rest she needed.

The new company of missionaries sailed from San Francisco on May 15th, 1889, and arrived safely at their destinations in June. Cheered by these reinforcements, the missionaries at either station could write hopefully just before winter set in. At Bethel health had been restored to Mrs. Kilbuck. About twenty children, who must be boarded and clothed, were attending the school. And decided progress these Esquimaux have made, the English handwriting of some of them being really creditable. In fact. Mr. Kilbuck wrote that he might send two promising lads to Pennsylvania erelong, to prepare for evangelistic work among their own people. One of the other missionaries considered the patience and carefulness of some of the boys so remarkable, that he believed they might be trained for a craft as difficult as the watchmaker's.

Such in brief is the story of the Moravian Mission in Alaska. Each station is now supplied with five missionaries, two male and three female, the latest additions being a Miss Lebus and a sister of Miss Huber. The two Esquimaux lads, referred to above, are at Carlisle, in Pennsylvania, under charge of Captain Pratt. Bishop H. T. Bachman, of the Moravian Church, whose wife returned safely the previous year. last summer paid the mission an official visitation. He describes the outlook as hopeful. About fifty natives are connected with both stations. Two Esquimaux, on recommendation of the missionaries, were by him formally commissioned as lay evangelists. A third station will probably soon be begun.

Though it needs years to acquire the language, to translate the Scriptures, establish schools, and have the good seed germinate in the hearts and bear fruit in the lives of heathen utterly ignorant and degraded as were the Esquimaux, enough has been accomplished to render safe the assertion, that in the person of John Henry Kilbuck, successfully heralding Christ to the Esquimaux of the Kuskokwim, bread " cast upon the waters" is being found " after many days."

If the maintenance of the languishing mission among his people in Kansas, fast hurrying to extinction, had accomplished little else than the raising up of such a man, a true Christian hero, it could not rightly be called labor spent in vain. The case of one such representative of the fruit of Christian philanthropy directed toward an isolated remnant of a race which many wrongly or rightly believe to be doomed, voices with striking encouragement to every missionary society the inspired admonition of the ancient sage : " In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand ; for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good."

The success, moreover, of this noble Indian in reaching the hearts of the Esquimaux with the message of life, does it not anew make plain that there is no form of barbarism so debased as to be beyond the reach of Christianity and therefore also of civilization ? The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation, in the very widest sense of that term—salvation of soul and of body also. It can reach and eventually remove every species of savagery.

Hence it is the duty of the Church of Christ, aside of its strategic onslaughts upon unbelief and misbelief among the higher races of the heathen, not to neglect also those that are tending to extinction and that exercise little or no influence in the world. When successful among these, the Church will not only convey to them an unspeakable boon, and have " the blessing of him that was ready to perish come upon" her ; but thereby also testify to the Christless in civilized lands, that there are higher motives in this world than those which well up from the fountain of selfishness, and that there is an unquenchable and limitless power in the " glorious Gospel of the blessed God."

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

PALESTINE ABOUT THE YEAR 1400 B.C. ACCORDING TO NEW SOURCES.

(*Condensed translation of an inaugural lecture of Dr. H. Zimmer, of the University of Halle, published in the " Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palæstina-Vereins."* Band *XIII. heft.* 3, *pp.* 133–147, *by Rev. Professor George H. Schodde, Ph.D., Capital University, Columbus, O.*)

In undertaking to address you this day on the condition of Palestine about the year 1400 B.C. there is need of a brief apology. It would be out of place to attempt such a description if we had at our command only those materials as sources of information, which prominent representatives of Old Testament research and of the history of the ancient Orient have used and utilized in their works. For that which we learn of the condition of Palestine in the early ages from the Old Testament, as also from Egyptian sources, has been fully and satisfactorily gathered and reproduced by competent authorities, and a new investigation on the basis of these sources alone is uncalled for. In undertaking, then, to give at least one section from the very oldest history of Palestine, I do so because just in recent times new sources have been discovered for this period, and that, too, such sources and in such a form that they have in a very peculiar sense addressed themselves to my lines of investigation, and have accordingly been of special interest to me.

You have all, no doubt, heard from time to time of the interesting finds which were made three years ago at Tell-el-Amarna, in Egypt, where several hundred letters, in cuneiform writing, and almost entirely in the Assyrian language, have been discovered. At any rate, the periodicals and papers of all descriptions have brought full details concerning these discoveries. Especial interest has been excited by the letters of Babylonian, Assyrian, and other hither-Asiatic kings addressed to the two Egyptian kings, Amenophis III. and Amenophis IV. For our present purposes these letters, too, have an important bearing, since the geographical position of Palestine, between Egypt and the kingdoms of hither-Asia, made it a country the possession of which easily became an apple of contention between these great powers, since through this narrow strip all the correspondence and letters between the Euphrates and the Nile countries had to pass ; but we must deal in this lecture particularly of those letters among the Tell-el-Amarna finds, which came from Phœnicia and Palestine themselves.

The writers of these last-mentioned epistles are, as a rule, native princes, who, however, were vassals of the Egyptian kings. That these letters, which, of course, treat mainly of the inner affairs of the districts over which the writers ruled, contain a mass of valuable information on the condition of Palestine at that era, is no more than can naturally be expected. Unfortunately just these letters have in part come down to us in a mutilated form; and in some cases this is so bad that not even the general surroundings of the letters can be solved. Then, too, only a portion of these letters—namely, those in the museums of Berlin and of Bulaq, have been published; namely, by H. Winckler, in his "Der Thontafelfund von el Amarna," Berlin, 1889–90. Of the smaller, but seemingly very fair-sized number in the British Museum, only a few letters have been issued —namely, by Budge, in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology, vol. x., 1887–88. However, enough has been edited of this find to give us a fairly complete general picture of the condition of Palestine and Phœnicia in the period in which these letters were written.

This period is the time of the fifteenth and the fourteenth centuries B.C.; for these letters were written at the same time when the letters of the hither-Asiatic kings were composed, *i.e.*, in the close of the reign of Amenophis III. and in the beginning of the reign of his successor, Amenophis IV.; or, in other words, about the year 1400 B.C. Just from this period we had hitherto as good as no information from other sources; for while we have from the contents from the Annals of Thutmosis III. from the first half of the fifteenth pre-Christian century, rather fair information on the state of hither-Asia from that period, and the accounts of Rameses II. treat of the events of the fourteenth century, there exists a gap between Thutmosis III. and Rameses II. in the Egyptian reports, which gap has been filled out splendidly by these letters dating from the era of Amenophis III. and Amenophis IV.

The general political status of Palestine and the surrounding lands in that period can, on the basis of these letters, be characterized to this effect, that the Egyptian supremacy did indeed officially exist, but was beginning to show signs of collapse, while the Hittites and the peoples connected with them were extending their rule farther and farther to the south and west, and were rapidly crowding Egypt out of its predominating position in Phœnicia and Palestine, and to assume the leading control of these lands. The advance of the Hittites was facilitated by the fact that a number of local princes in the north of Palestine assisted them in their undertaking. It is, indeed, true that not one as yet openly dares to raise the flag of rebellion against Egyptian supremacy in Palestine; for so powerful was yet the Egyptian name, although the rulers then on the throne did but little to maintain their authority abroad. On the contrary, the Palestine vassals in their official correspondence with the Egyptian kings all assure them of their fidelity and deepest submission; but behind the back of the king a number of them conspire in conjunction with the Hittites. In this connection these letters present an interesting picture of the constant rivalry of these princes of each other, as the vast number of small states and governments then existing in Palestine quite naturally would lead us to suppose. Accordingly the accusations against each other constantly increase, as also the letters of self-defence and justification. In order to illustrate the state of affairs, I will cite a passage from a letter of a certain *Rib-Addi*, from *Gabla* (gebāl in the Old Testament; Byblos, is Greek; *dshebel*, at present, a little to the north of Beyrut) on the Phœnician coast. The letters just of this *Rib-Addi* are especially numerous. In these he is constantly complaining concerning a certain *Abdi-Ashirti* (a name corresponding to the Hebrew *Abd-Ashera*), who like *Rib-Addi* is also a vassal of the Egyptian king, charging his neighboring prince that he is working in the interests of the Hittites in Phœnicia and Palestine and to the detriment of Egypt. This *Rib-Addi* writes, among other things, as follows: "The king, my lord, is to be informed that the enmity of *Abdi-Ashirti* against me is exceedingly strong. Now he is seeking to tear those cities which alone had been left me, out of my hands." Again he writes: "How does it happen that *Abdi-Ashirti*, the servant, tries to seize all the cities of the king, the Sun?" "A servant of the king of the land of *Mitana* and of the king of the land of *Kashsha* (a parallel reading adds of the king of the land of *Chata*; *i.e.*, the land of the Hittites) he is, for he is trying to take the land of the king for himself." At the close of this letter *Rib-Addi* begs the king to send him a large number of troops, "in order that they can drive the enemies of the king out of the country, so that all the lands may again come into the possession of the king." This same *Abdi-Ashirti*, who in these letters of *Rib-Addi* is constantly charged with conspiracy, on his side declares to the king of Egypt, in a letter, as follows: "Behold, I am a servant of the king, and a servant of his palace; the western country in its entirety I hold fast for the king, my lord, in firm protection." And with special reference to the advance of the king of the Hittites, another writes several times as follows: "The king of the land of *Chatti* is in the land of *Nushashshe*, and I am afraid of him, that he is marching against the west land, the land of the king, my lord. Therefore let the king send me troops and chariots to help me, so that I can protect the land of the king, my lord."

While pressing petitions from the Phœnician coast cities against the encroachments of the Hittites and against the vassals aiding them are sent again and again to the king of Egypt, there is another and different enemy in the south of Palestine, who is causing trouble to the Egyptian supremacy and the Palestinian vassals faithful to their sovereign. This new enemy is designated by the name of the *Chabiri* nation. It is, indeed, yet uncertain whether these *Chabire* or *Chabiri* nation are to be identified with the *Ibrim*, or Hebrews, or not; although much can be said in favor of this identification. If this identification can be proved, then these letters, in which mention is made so often of the *Chabiri*, would be of the greatest importance for the discussion of the much-ventilated questions as to the time and manner of the migration of the Hebrews into the country west of the Jordan. I add in this connection that from the philological point of view this identification is not impossible; since just in Palestinian names the *Ajin*, and especially when this letter begins a syllable, in Assyrian, is reproduced in a *Cheth*, *e.g.*, *Chazzalu* for *Gaza: Chumri* for Omri. As in the northern parts of Palestine the way for the enemy was prepared by *Abdi-Ashirti*, thus it happened in Southern Palestine that the *Chabiri* people found a helper in the native vassals of the Egyptian king, especially a certain *Ili-Milki* (the same as the Hebrew *Elimelek*), whose name is frequently inverted to Milki-il. Just as *Abdi-Ashirti*, in Northern Palestine, was opposed by a faithful vassal *Rib-Addi*, then this *Ili-Milki* and his friends in Southern Palestine were opposed by a vassal faithful to the Egyptian king. This vassal's name is *Abdi-Chiba*, who writes his letters from a place called *Urusalim*, *i.e.*, no other city than Jerusalem. This fact alone is already of special interest, that Jerusalem is mentioned by name in these texts, and that, too, by the name by which it was known in later periods, and not, as we might expect from the statements of the Old Testament, by the name of *Jebus*. But the contents of these letters—of which there are six in the Royal Museum at Berlin—are full of rich data. It appears from these that the Jerusalem of that day was already a place of great importance among the cities of Southern Palestine, as also that the ruler of Jerusalem in that time stood in an even greater dependence from the king of Egypt than did many of the other Palestinian princes. For if the words of *Abdi-Chiba* have been correctly interpreted, he really did not occupy the position of a prince proper, as the office was not hereditary, but he held it as a present from the Egyptian king. In regard to this matter we can cite a few statements from these letters. One of them begins as follows: "To the king, my lord, from *Abdi-Chiba*, his servant. To the feet of my lord, the king, I fall down seven times. What have I done to my lord, the king? They are slandering me to my lord, the king, saying, *Abdi-Chiba* is a rebel against his lord, the king. Behold, as far as I am concerned, it was not my father nor my mother that put me into this place, but it was the arm of the mighty king who has caused me to enter into my father's house. Why should I sin against my lord king? As long as the lord, my king, lives, I say to the messenger of the king, my lord, Why do ye favor the *Chabiri* people and are hostile to the præfects?" The concluding words of this letter are these: "All the præfects have been destroyed; for there is none left of the præfects of the lord, my king. Therefore may the king turn his face to his people and send troops from the garrisons of my lord, the king. There are none left of the land of the lord, my king. The *Chabiri* people have plundered the lands of the king. If troops can yet come in this year, then the lands of the king can yet be preserved; but if no troops are sent, then there will be no more lands and no more præfects of the lord, my king. Behold, as far as the land of this city of Jerusalem is concerned, it was not my father nor my mother who gave it to me; it was the arm [of the mighty king] who gave it to me. Behold, this deed is a deed of *Milki-il* and a deed of *Lapapi*, who are handing over this country to the *Chabiri* people." The concluding words of the letter are these: "Behold, the king has established his name upon the land of Jerusalem forever; therefore he cannot desert the land of the city of Jerusalem!"

A further letter of *Abdi-Chiba* begins

with the customary words: "Behold, the king, my lord, has established his name at the rising of the sun and at the setting of the sun. Behold, I am not a præfect, but an *amel* of the king, my lord; behold, I am an *amel* of the king and one who brings tribute to the king. It was not my father nor my mother, but the arm of the mighty king that has placed me in my father's house." Farther on in the letter he says: "If only a ship is on the sea, then the arm of the mighty king takes into his possession the land of *Narima* (Euphrates land) and the land of the *Kasi* (Babylon). And shall now the *Chabiri* people take the cities of the king? There is not one præfect left of the king, my lord; all have been destroyed. Therefore let the king direct his face to his people and help the lands and send troops. If troops do not arrive this year yet, then all the lands of the lord, my king, will be lost." Finally, a last letter of *Abdi-Chiba*, after the customary opening formula, continues as follows: "Behold the deeds which *Mikilu* and *Shu-ardatum* have done against the land of the lord, my king. They have caused the armies of the city *Gazri* (*i.e.*, Geser), the armies of the city of *Gimti* (*i.e.*, Gath), and the armies of the city of *Kilti* (*i.e.*, probably Kigela) to march out, and they have captured the territory of the city of *Rubute* (*i.e.*, probably Rabba of Jos. xv. 60). The land has been given over to the *Chabiri* people, but now yet is added as a city of the territory of Jerusalem, the city of *Bit-Ninip* = *Shumasu* (*i.e.*, Beth Shemes [?]), a city of the king, has fallen into the hands of the enemy, as also the people of *Kilti*. Therefore may the king listen to *Abdi-Chiba*, his servant, and send troops, so that I can conquer again the land of the king for the king. But if no troops are sent, then the land of the king will fall into the hands of the *Chabiri* people."

I have intentionally given you some longer extracts of these letters from Jerusalem, in order to enable you to form your own judgment as to the historical value of these letters. It, of course, must be acknowledged that a final and in every way satisfactory judgment just of these letters cannot yet be expected. At all events, a fuller examination of other texts must yet determine who the *Chabiri* people are. Possibly the yet unpublished texts will contain some letters written by the *Chabiri* friend, *Milki-il*. If it should prove to be true that the *Chabiri* are the Hebrews, then the context of the Hebrews with the *Adonibesek* (as the textual criticism of Judges i. correctly reads) will appear in an altogether new light.

Having, then, in two characteristic examples from the farthest north and the extreme south of Palestine shown you how these letters give new light on the history of Palestine at that early period, it would be in place to add also some extracts from the kings of the Babylonians to Amenophis IV., which also deal of the status of Palestine. However, we have as yet only one such letter—namely, that of King *Burraburjash*, in which the Babylonian king asks the king of Egypt not to lend his ear to those Assyrians who have come to him to complain and to seek to become independent of the Babylonian authority; assigning as a reason that on a previous occasion his own father, the king of Babylonia, had not listened to certain Egyptian rebels.

These letters, too, contain much good material for the historical geography of Palestine, as it mentions a great many names of cities whose existence at so early a date is not known from other sources of an equally early date. In many respects the Tell-el-Amorna finds have also shed new light on the state of civilization in Palestine in those times. Who would have thought of it, that in the year 1400 B.C. a prince of Jerusalem would send a letter to an Egyptian king in *Babylonian* cuneiform writing. The natural supposition would have been that such a correspondence would have been conducted in the *Egyptian* language; but it now appears that the Babylonian was at that early period the official language of diplomacy, and this fact testifies strongly of the early influence of Babylonian culture in Western Asia. This gives us an entirely new perspective of the influence of Babylonian ideas on the Old Testament literature, even in the times preceding the Kings and the Exile. Then, too, the many proper names found in these letters gives us new material for the study of the religion of the Gentile Canaanites.

THE PLACE OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER IN POLITICS.

I.

BY THE REV. CANON BARKER, M.A., RECTOR OF MARYLEBONE, AND CHAPLAIN TO THE QUEEN.

From *The Review of the Churches* (London), December, 1891.

It appears to me that the place of the Christian minister in politics is an important and foremost one. I would distinguish between politics and party politics; with the latter, as such, he should have little to do. He is chiefly concerned in good government, in the moral and spiritual reformation and improvement of the people; and so far as politics have to do with these, he should exercise his influence to the fullest extent. In these days particularly the Christian minister has important duties to perform in the sphere of politics. He has, as far as his influence reaches, to endeavour to raise the tone of political life, to see in the first instance that such men represent constituencies whose character, as far as can be ascertained, is above reproach, and then that they are men inspired with a real moral earnestness, who are seeking a political life not for amusement, excitement, or anything else but the real progress of the people. The Christian minister can and ought to exercise his influence in the selection of candidates for Parliament. As most questions are now more or less political, I do not see how a Christian minister who cares about his religion and his country can hold aloof from politics. Take, for instance, the whole range of social reform, including education, temperance, purity, sanitation, and all that concerns the future welfare of the people. Perhaps no body of men could exercise greater influence in promoting these reforms than Christian ministers, and if working for these brings them in close contact with politics, that cannot be helped, and would not be a good thing if it could. I do not think it is the duty or the place of a Christian minister to be stumping the country on political platforms. His place is among his own people, and to them he should make his political views clearly known, and among them quietly and as occasion arises it is his duty to express and explain his views on great public questions. If he resides among a working-class population, his time would be well spent in giving instruction upon political economy and political science in general. I am wholly opposed to introducing politics, even remotely, into the pulpit. On the whole, then, the Christian minister, like any other citizen, should take his part in the great political controversies of the day, and do his best to promote such a settlement of them as will in his judgment promote the highest interests of the people.

I have no sympathy with those who think that the Christian minister must concern himself only with those matters which relate to the future world. This world is something, even though it is passing away, and its interests and concerns monopolize a large proportion of men's thoughts, and to have no sympathy with them is simply to be uninfluential. In my judgment, the main cause of the comparative little influence, in proportion to its numbers and education, of the Christian ministry, is that the people feel that they are not understood by it. Men must be reached by sympathy, and to stand outside all that interests and concerns them, is practically to be useless to them morally or spiritually. The Christian ministry holds a unique position for leavening all classes with higher sentiments and ideals, for softening the acerbities of political life, for rounding the angularities of character and opinion. All that concerns man concerns the Christian minister, and in these days how active and eager are all men—how strong is the tide of new ideas, new aspirations, new desires. We are in one of the great transition times of history. The old is passing away, and the new is coming into view. With the vast increase of population, wealth, and enterprise, new problems arise, affecting capital, labor, and all the higher interests of man. Questions of intense interest present themselves for solution—how can more share in the common weal of the realm? how can ignorance and pauperism be lessened? how can self-respect and self-dependence be more deeply implanted in the breasts of all classes? how can the spiritual nature of the people be developed and deepened? All these are political questions, and the Christian minister away from personal and selfish interest can play a great part in helping to solve these questions. His sympathy, his ministry itself, his mission, all alike point him out as a great force in such matters. His voice, his presence, his pen, should always be at the service of the weak, the struggling, and the ignorant. Questions which affect them, such as education, temperance, thrift, purity, self control, should be his questions. The rights of the poor, the rights of labor, the rights of women, should be his rights. The place the Great Master took in all that concerned the people is an example to his ministers. He went about doing them good. The common people heard him gladly. To the poor he preached the gospel of brotherhood, peace and good will. When the Christian minister is on the side of the rich, the privileged, the powerful, so far as they militate against the progress of the people upwards, he is on the wrong side. His place is a middle one, reconciling classes, bridging over parties, conciliating opposing forces, endeavouring to preserve, pure and unsullied, the abstract principles of right, justice, and truth. If the Christian minister would hold such a position, he would become a powerful influence for good in the State, being able to act as arbitrator in questions of dispute, to advise in difficulties, and to guide in emergencies. May the Church of the future be marked by greater sympathy with the poor and suffering, by lifting the human more to the level of the divine, by making the dividing line between nature and religion less and less deep and sharp. Then would the Church occupy a glorious position, sharing in all the interests, pleasures, progresses of the nation, being one with, and not separate as a class from the great seething eager mass of humanity, bringing back all men to that ideal held aloft by the Great Divine Politician that all are brethren. When the Church forgets her own interests, her own ambitions, her own position, and is lost in the miseries and wants and trials and sufferings of the world, she will then be the strongest, the most blessed and most glorious influence in this world of God.

W. BARKER.

II.

THE REV. W. TUCKWELL.

"There are no snakes in Iceland" is a not uncommon solution of the problem. And if by politics is meant the vulgarity of Party strife—the ignoble fight between kites and crows, warring under the name of Whigs and Tories, Conservatives and Liberals, for domination over the poultry—the answer is conclusive in the case of all good men ; of parsons, who are good by Act of Parliament, among the rest. But to the great Greek philosophers who coined the word twenty-five centuries ago, as to the nobler statesmen who employ it now, politics was the science of human happiness ; and since in our own land the few *are* happy to the extent of material well-being, the many forlorn and miserable by reason of foul homes, overwork, underpay, here in England politics has come to mean social and industrial reform, the elevation of our prostrate masses from poverty and slavery into competence and freedom.

There are then snakes in Iceland ; there is a place in politics for the parson. The parson knows professionally, as few others know, the condition of his submerged brethren ; their habits, their grievances, their needs, are strewn around his daily path ; he is, by virtue of his office, an adept in what Dean Mansel used to call ptochology, the science which estimates and classifies pauperage, mendicancy, unemploy. Nor yet an adept merely ; carrying the flag of a Gospel preached to the poor, he is emphatically the champion of the poor. A mission he has no doubt to the "poor rich men" of whom Burke speaks ; but his message there is often the reverse of friendly—a reminder of the rich fool's doom, of the camel and the needle's eye, of the flame-tortured Dives, of the command to sell all and give, of the Apostolic community of goods. The rich have many friends ; the poor have none, except the Carpenter's Son, who knew not where to lay His head, and His representatives from age to age, the credentials of whose embassy are written in their tender resemblance to their Master.

"The parson's business is to preach." Yes—but to preach what ? It was a saying of Arnold Toynbee that the pastor who would hope to further religious development must begin by preaching social reform. The aphorism "drops truth distinct and clear." I remember, many years ago, attending a clerical meeting in the large town where I had just begun to work, convened to discuss the spiritual darkness of certain outlying suburbs. It was proposed with unction, and determined with complacency, that on successive Sundays a cart should go round these benighted districts and leave at every door a Bible, or a prayer book, or a hymn book. There was an old white-haired clergyman present, whose life had been spent in these back streets, and he rose to urge a rider to the motion. "Your resolve is good," he said, "but it is insufficient. You must first send round your cart upon successive Saturdays, laden, not with Bible, prayer book, hymn book, but with legs of mutton and with rounds of beef, and loaves of bread, and pounds of tea, for these poor things are starving, and starvation is a soil in which piety will not grow." I was a very young curate at the time, and, like all the very young curates I have ever met, I was exceedingly ignorant and foolish, and I thought the old man's carnal plea irreverent ; but a year of slumming taught me that it was profoundly wise and true. Deep down in the hearts of the most degraded class is the *jashub* of Isaiah and Micah—political parsons both—the germinal "remnant" of purity and goodness which would still reflect, could illumination reach it, the image of its Creator ; but an overlying mass of social misery cuts off its light and chokes its growth, and the first duty of Christ's minister must be to shovel away this hindering, festering, deadening heap, that light and air may penetrate the germ and suffer the dead men to arise.

The parson then is to preach reform. Shall his medium be the pulpit or the platform? Hardly the pulpit, as to-day interpreted and accepted. The free handling of subjects which Pharisaism chooses to call "secular"; the sparkle, anecdote, humour, comedy, essential to the popular enlightenment of difficult and complicated problems, would revolt a generation stiffened by three centuries of conventional synagogism. If Latimer were to preach his Sermon on the Card in a modern West End church, the churchwardens would present him to the bishop. And were it otherwise, the pulpit fails to reach the class which needs the "authentic gospel" of formulated discontent and organized remonstrance. Our churches are peopled by respectability, and respectability is no longer the centre of political and social gravity. The ultimate power of the realm resides not with the church-going *Ingenui*, but with the slum-haunting *Proletarii;* the throne of England rests upon the ballot-box. Now the Proletarian *is* drawn to the platform. In large town, small town, village, the political meeting has to-day no rival in attractiveness, and the feeling which crowds the rooms is no longer primarily partisan; it still clusters round the Parliamentary candidate or member, but its motive is desire for education, discernment of the new meaning of politics, appreciation of its perplexities, eager craving for, and grateful acceptance of, utterances instinct with sympathetic knowledge and sped by rhetorical power. And an increasing number of speakers is rising to the new demand. Iteration of the "Liberal party," clap-trap citings of "our great leader's" name, vulgar abuse of opponents, local or personal allusions, become less frequent year by year. The condition of England, the cruel disabilities of the men whose labours make it great, the causes and the remedies of their sufferings, are handled with wide knowledge and experience of our own and other lands, with clear investigation and patient argument, often in a tone of deep religious feeling which bids fair to set the platform higher than the pulpit. I listened to such a speech not long ago. The inner life of our towns and villages was described from personal knowledge; the anomalies of land, labour, education, local government, religious endowment, Parliamentary machinery, were dissected, with condensed scrutiny and with audacious frankness. There was no lack of humour to relieve the pathos or the denunciation; laughter alternated with cheers amongst the audience; but over the whole deliverance brooded a Christ-like tenderness of sympathy, and it closed with a grand Scripture peroration. The strong emotion to which the hearers had been lifted survived the routine utterance of compliments which ensued. The chairman called for "God save the Queen." There was no response; a single note from the platform began, and fluttered, solitary and broken-winged to the ground. "Let us sing the Doxology," said a strong voice amongst the crowd, and the great burst of praise to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost gave fit expression to the pent up *religious* feeling which politics, rightly understood and preached, had engendered in all our hearts.

I say that this is parsons' work. I say that the clergy of the Established Church, whose progress through past history is paved with forfeited opportunities, are wasting this, the most fruitful, and perhaps the last. The country parson sees in the village where he claims spiritual chieftainship as God's viceroy, foul rookeries in which a single bedroom holds eight inmates, open drains generating typhoid centres: let him in pulpit, village meeting, local press, placard the villainy of cottage-owners and the neglect of sanitary authorities! He knows the labourer's wage to be barely half the sum on which a growing family can be maintained in decency and comfort; let him initiate practical reform by extensive and equitable allotments; let him master the history of our land laws, compare the agrarian prosperity of other countries with our own agrarian pauperism; plead and champion the changes to which his knowledge and his reasoning point, regardless of the anger of Dives, merciful to Lazarus' sores. The town parson is brought face to face with the crimes of industrial monopoly—employers in homes spacious, luxurious, sanitary, commanding leisure and resource; workmen housed in crowded cottages, breathing tainted air, cut off by daily overwork from all appetite for healthy self-improvement, rebelling ever and anon in wasteful strikes, or storing up a sullen anger which will some day break in revolution. In the political troubles of 1848, two clergymen were the trusted advisers of the English malcontents; that civil war and bloodshed were averted was due in no small measure to their counsel and their influence; the relation of Maurice and Kingsley to the London Chartists then should be the attitude of every urban clergyman to-day to the workmen, trades unionists, socialists of the town where he assumes that God has placed him. If Christ were to come among us now, with whom would He consort? With capitalists, employers, land-owners, leaders of the religious world? or with starveling outcasts, shivering unemployed, criminals whom society has begotten into or driven into crime, labourers to whom it holds out the workhouse as the meed of life-long wealth-producing toil? Read Lowell's "Parable," and see! These enigmas constitute politics — politics in the highest, truest sense. God's kingdom cannot come on earth until they be faced, interpreted, answered, solved.

How dares the parson stand aloof from them? All things combine to fit him for the part of Œdipus to the Sphinx which lowers over our community. His worldly position is secure; behind his inalienable home and stipend he can defy the threats of power which his championship of the oppressed provokes. When class collides with mass, he is the born intercessory arbitrator between them; belonging to the one by privileged and educational rank, to the other by ordained Christian brotherhood. Viewed by the rich with a respect sometimes genuine, always formally effective, his prestige with the poor is not so far extinct but that awakened perception of his duty would revive it. He holds position and endowment in trust as officer of a church, national to include the masses, cultured to instruct them. If he herds only with the privileged, if he shrinks from the sociological and economic problems which press most exactingly on scientific acquirement, his claim to exist is at an end, he will have wooed the extinction which menaces his order.

How shall we explain parsonic apathy? Why is it that, when society is stirred to its centre with revolutionary movements, the accredited religious and educational leaders of society ignore them? that the so-called Radical parsons—the men who grapple with domestic sordor, who take part in industrial convulsions, pioneer allotments, stand forth on platforms to denounce high-placed evil-doers and to make mute suffering articulate—are mere scattered Abdiels in the great host of their compeers? The reason is, I think, threefold:

1. History includes, among the evil incidents of a religious establishment, that its officials almost of necessity consort, obsequiously or fraternally, with the well-to-do; the self-forgetfulness of missionary zeal is cramped by the chain of social rank; men set their establishment above their Church, and so, inevitably, their Church above their Christ. As creeds are formulated to reinforce a faith which has become conventional, so establishments are constructed to buttress tottering Churches. A Church established by Act of Parliament is a creature of wax and parchment; a Church established in a nation's heart is a manifest ambassador of the Most High.

2. Sociology is not among the subjects taught at public schools and universities. As regards the vital interests of the day—the land question, the industrial question, the fissures and settlements in our social edifice, the massing of the labour-hosts for organised revolt—the Common-rooms are up in a balloon, the political economy of the Tripos is obsolete; the golden youth of the public school, the gilded youth of the grammar school, learn to divide their fellows into "gentlemen and cads" by a line drawn on the southern boundary of the "liberal professions." Thus untaught, thus prepossessed, the fledgling parson enters on his mission, an Ovid among the Goths, prepared indeed to look upon the "working class" as spiritual harvest ripening for the sickle of the "Church," but having no more solidarity amongst them, fellowship with their wrongs, comprehension of their grievances, needs, aims, than has the serene angel in the front of All Souls' College with the wastrels weltering in purgatory down below. "O God, make these poor women contented with their lot," was the weekly prayer of a country rectoress in opening her mothers' meeting.

3. The parson who imitates Christ has a heavy penalty to pay. He is secure against the starvational ruin which the anger of employer, landlord, farmer, can wreak upon the offending hind; but he is vulnerable in other points. He has a wife and daughters possibly, capable of emitting shrieks at exclusion from the squire's dinner table and the tennis lawns of the gentry round about, at the gravel path unfurrowed by wheels of carriage callers, the girls partnerless at county balls. Or social vengeance takes a subtler form and appeals to finer scruples. His village is materially well equipped, the squire has built him a reading room, the farmers support his schools, the parish aristocracy each Sunday fills its cushioned pews and imitative cottagers follow it; the well-filled church is soothing to his clerical self-respect, the bountiful collections support his choir, keep his churchyard trim, relieve his sick and needy. But he knows the

tenure of his parochial prosperity; his share in the bargain with good-natured Mammon is unwritten but well-defined—"All these things will I give thee *if thou wilt fall down and worship me.*" If he breaks the compact, all are taken from him; not only are kindly greetings supplanted by a scowl, the touched hat by an averted face; not only is he vilified in provincial newspapers, persecuted by anonymous letters, cut by old school-fellows in the street, but his church is emptied, his offertories dwindle, his improvement schemes, concert, lecture, dance, are thwarted, and the stream of his alms is dried. Piteous letters came from parsons when the protest against Irish evictions was sent round for clerical signature three years ago. Sad confessions encounter me on my missionary journeys from clergymen who come stealthily to say how they applaud and envy the line I take, yet shrink from it, not on their own account, but for the sake of parish and of poor on whom their independence would be visited.

Toward Naaman bowing in the house of Rimmon, toward Nicodemus coming to Christ by night, we all feel lenient; but they are not the raw material out of which martyrdoms are refined. And so it will be said that my answer to the question which heads this paper resolves itself into an indictment of the clergy. Be it so. I plead that a Christian church exists primarily for the sake of the oppressed, the poor, the people; that a professed messenger of Christ ought to find his scope and satiate his enthusiasm amongst Publicans and sinners rather than amongst Scribes and Pharisees; that a class endowed with exclusive prerogative and wealth as appanages to spiritual leadership of a great nation is bound to justify its monopoly by sagacious intervention, by mediatorial adroitness, if necessary by self-sacrificing leadership. I say that the Anglican clergy, as a body, tried by all these tests, has failed; failed—as it failed in the Lollard upheaval of the fourteenth century, in the Wesley revival of the eighteenth; failed, as in the dockers' strike of two years back, in the village movement of to-day. It is not too late for repentance; but the sands are running out.

W. Tuckwell.

III.

The Rev. J. Guinness Rogers.

The Nonconformist minister is a politician *malgre lui*. He may carefully eschew all political association, he may never be seen at a meeting which has even a quasi-political character, he may never express an opinion on any of the questions of the hour, and may, in fact, regard politics with that curious kind of holy horror which we find in certain pietists, but all this does not free him from the taint he so much dreads. His ministry is itself a standing protest against a prerogative which the State has unjustly arrogated to itself. The true nature of Nonconformity is strangely misconceived by numbers. There are some religious differences in the United States as among ourselves, but while our American cousins and our Colonial kindred, too, are divided into Episcopalians and Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians, Baptists and Pædo-Baptists, as we are, there are among them no Nonconformists. The State assumes no right to establish a Church or to set up a standard of orthodoxy, and consequently the distinction which is a line of cleavage through all classes of society is absolutely unknown. Dissent is therefore distinctly a political action, based, it may be, on religious grounds, but not the less on that account a civic proceeding.

But the question of Disestablishment does not occupy the whole field of politics, although it extends much further than is generally understood. It is intimately related to most of those social reforms which are destined to absorb so much thought and attention in the future, and in which the ministers of the Gospel cannot afford to be neutral, unless they are prepared to see Christianity treated as a spent and useless force. This applies to the leaders of all churches, but the Nonconformist minister in particular will best promote the principles in whose success he is specially interested if his whole political conduct shows that he advocates them on broad national grounds, for the good of the people rather than for the redress of some sectarian wrong.

The question which every minister has to decide for himself is how he can best render that service to humanity which is the true service of God. In the present state of society, and with the tendencies which are daily gathering new strength, it is simply impossible that he can fulfil his duty either to God or to his neighbour if he eschew politics. There are various considerations that might tempt him to adopt such a course, and some of them cannot be regarded as ignoble. There is much in political life that repels men of scrupulous honour and fastidious honour, and which must be far more offensive to one of deep religious feeling. But it is not to be supposed that a

Christian man should become the slave of a party, imbibing all its prejudices, committing himself to a blind approval of all its procedure, and sacrificing everything to secure its triumph. If a politician is to effect any good, he must belong to a party, but it is not necessary that he should therefore be a bigoted partisan. Experience has taught me to have little faith in those superior persons who ostentatiously proclaim their independence of all party ties, and who by their candid criticisms, especially in crises of difficulty, do more injury to the cause to which they profess allegiance than its avowed and active foes. But all confederacies—political at least as much as any other—are all the better for having in them some who are not blind to their faults, and not afraid to attempt the difficult task of correcting them. This is the element which Christian ministers may well supply. I remember Mr. John Morley once saying how valuable were the criticisms of the "uninitiated" to those who are in the thick of the fight. We are, and may well be content to be, among the "uninitiated." With the personal jealousies and petty intrigues, the disappointed ambitions and tortuous policies which demoralize and degrade political life, we are not complicated. At all events we may safely say that we have no personal objects to serve, and are therefore free from the bias of self-interest. We look at questions with more singleness of eye, and we contemplate them from a different standpoint from that of the combatants themselves. Hence there is a freshness of thought which to those of more experience may look like the verdure of innocence, but which, nevertheless, has a distinct value. What, however, is the distinctive point, and that of the highest importance, is that the Christian minister has a different test by which to prove all things, and as he professes to be under the government of higher principles, has counsels to give altogether different from those of a worldly policy, however noble may be its aims.

How he can best render this service is a question of even more difficulty. It is an established belief in some circles that Nonconformist ministers are in the habit of using their pulpits for political purposes. My own knowledge, which is tolerably extensive, of Congregational practice at all events, leads me to say that if they did they would soon have no pulpits to use. There have been occasional departures from the ordinary practice in great crises, when the issues involved have lain outside the lines of party warfare, but sermons that can properly be described as political are extremely rare, and I sincerely hope they will be even rarer.

In these I do not include discourses, expounding and enforcing the law of that righteousness which exalteth a nation. A Christian minister can hardly omit these if he is to declare the whole counsel of God. The time and manner in which it can best be done must be determined by his own conscience, and in deciding such points he will show proper regard to the "proportion of faith," and be careful that the proclamation of the Gospel of the Divine Love be the leading theme of his ministry. But he has to preach Christ Jesus Lord as well as Saviour, and his ministry cannot be effective and complete in this particular unless the laws of His kingdom in relation to every department of human action be clearly laid down. There is a crying need for a teaching that shall deal faithfully with the common things of life. If we were to believe a good deal of talk upon the subject, this is the very teaching which the world is demanding from the pulpit. I greatly doubt it. There is a certain style of practical preaching for which numbers clamour, but in order to meet their views it would need to be very limited in its range and guarded in its character. It must be careful not to offend prejudice, and in order to this it must be very chary in setting forth unpopular truths or attacking fashionable sins. But these are just the points which the loyal servant of Christ needs to emphasize, and if he does this he will hardly escape censure as a political preacher. He will deserve it only if he descends from the inculcation of Christ's law and turns His pulpit into a platform for the advocacy of party aims and interests.

The necessity for maintaining this distinction becomes all the more imperative with the increasing prominence given to social questions. Christian ministers cannot keep clear of them, and yet it will need great delicacy in the handling of them if they are to escape the imputation of being the champions of a class. It is very easy to indulge in mere platitudes, and as unsatisfactory and profitless as it would be easy. Men are too deeply in earnest on these subjects to be put off by well-turned phrases or high-sounding sentiments which mean much or little. The man who is to secure respect for his teaching must have definite ideas, and must not shrink from expressing them at whatever cost of personal popularity.

On the Nonconformist minister the call

to wise action is so urgent as to be almost irresistible, since he is a representative of a system which is essentially democratic. A minister of Him whose glory it was that to the poor the Gospel is preached, ought to be popular in his sympathies. A Nonconformist minister is bound alike by his principles and traditions to the cause of the people. He will, indeed, I venture to think, make a serious mistake if, without any special qualification for the task, he undertakes to pronounce dogmatically on the various points of difference that are continually arising between employers and employed. The broad principles by which the relations between these two classes ought to be governed may be plain enough to every one who accepts the New Testament as a guide, but the application of them to the special condition of any trade controversy may not be so simple. The first are within the reach of every honest student, and on them a Christian minister is entitled to speak with some authority, but for the other the skill of an expert is required. A friend of mine was recently asked to mediate between an employer and his workpeople, who were on strike, and as he was trusted on both sides, he undertook the task with great hopefulness. But he soon discovered his mistake. Both parties were ready to agree on general principles; it was only when they came to their application to the special points at issue that the difference arose, and here my friend, though a man of ability and considerable experience of life, was quite unable to help, as most of his brethren would have been in like circumstances. The fact, however, that there are questions which must be referred to experts does not exempt Christian ministers from insisting on that law of Christian brotherhood to which all owe subjection, and by which all these relations should be governed. Without invading the province of others, there is a sphere of their own which they ought carefully to cultivate. Theirs should be a sweetening and healing influence helping to correct the mistakes, remove the prejudices, and soften the asperities of the contending parties, teaching each to recognise the good that is in the other, and repressing the vehemence of angry and excited partisans.

The people look, and look rightly, to Nonconformist ministers for full and ungrudging sympathy. But this will not be best shown by fostering class passions, unjust in themselves, and certain to be mischievous in their results. If they will look at the whole subject in a devout yet resolute spirit, resolved to face any possible amount of obloquy in their endeavour to raise the tone of political life to bring all public affairs under the sway of Christian principle, and to weld together different classes in the bonds of a true brotherhood, they will not only serve their own generation, but do the will of God.

J. Guinness Rogers.

IV.

Rev. F. W. Macdonald.

The grounds on which I have heard it maintained that Christian ministers should take an active part in politics are of the following kind:

The minister of religion is a citizen, and should exercise the full rights and privileges of citizenship. Citizenship, indeed, rightly regarded, is a sacred thing, and belongs to the divine order or plan of human affairs. The hackneyed distinction between sacred things and secular is, for the most part, false and misleading, and it is not for the Christian minister to give any sanction to the poor and narrow view of life that such a distinction implies. The minister must not be less of a citizen than his neighbour. On his lips the words "civis sum" should mean all that they can mean on any lips. And, seeing that citizenship involves responsibilities and duties, as well as privileges and rights, he is bound to fulfil them as completely as possible, not a small portion of them only, but the whole. Plainly, the State cannot afford that any class of citizens should keep aloof from public affairs, least of all a class that is presumably above the average in respect of intelligence and character.

Moreover, the Christian minister is, or should be, a teacher of righteousness. All political questions are, sooner or later, moral questions. From municipal bye-laws to the most momentous decisions of Parliament, everything has its moral aspect, and must ultimately be submitted to the tests of right and wrong, and judged as that which ought, or ought not, to be. Here is the opportunity, the special function, of the minister of religion. It is for him to apply to the shifting issues of the day "the eternal laws of truth and right," to stimulate and instruct the public conscience, to see to it that evil is not sanctioned, or iniquity hushed up, and generally, that the devil does not have his own way with princes, parliaments, and people.

This view of the Christian minister's relation to politics may be much more impressively put than I have put it, but whether these considerations, and others that might be added, are sufficient to sanction the career of the political parson may be doubted. There is another side to the matter, and another series of considerations to be weighed.

Granting all that can be said of the dignity of citizenship, it does not follow that it is wise for a minister of religion to exercise all its functions. True he is a citizen, but of a class that possesses special privileges and duties differentiating him from his fellow citizens. As a minister of the Gospel, and shepherd and bishop of souls, his vocation may well require the sacrifice of some things, and a prudential avoidance of others. If all things are lawful for him, all things may not be expedient. He is not the only man who, for the sake of a chosen life-work, gives up what otherwise would be well within his rights. If, for example, it is on the whole better that a judge, though possessing exceptional powers and a trained mind, should take no part in politics, it is, to say the least, conceivable that a minister of religion would do well to limit himself in a similar way. If it is desirable to preserve the judicial mind from the perturbations of political strife, and the judicial office from being associated with political interests, it may be equally desirable in the case of a Christian minister and his ministry. The more I think of it, the more inclined I am to think that this is so. There will from time to time be exceptional men and exceptional circumstances, but, as a rule, I believe that for the efficient discharge of a man's office as preacher and pastor, he must be willing to forego political life, and that any loss to the community which this sacrifice entails will be more than compensated by its advantages. Some men are big enough and strong enough to do anything, but most men are not. Here and there one may find a minister who can attend caucus meetings, and fight elections, and write fiery leading articles without loss of temper, or fairness, or devotion to the most spiritual aspects of his ministry. Here and there one may find him, but satisfaction at the sight is tempered by the thought that his success has tempted many a weaker brother to a course which, in his case, was little less than disastrous. The duties of the Christian ministry are so numerous, and the opportunities for good work which it affords so abundant, that few men can adequately cover them, and at the same time spread themselves over the field of politics.

I fear, moreover, that there is something flattering and deceptive in the minister's notion that his presence amongst politicians will lift politics appreciably nearer heaven. He intends it shall be so, he thinks it will be so, but, as a matter of fact, it does not necessarily happen. On the contrary, his appearance in a political conflict not seldom makes things hotter and bitterer all round. He is so conscious of his own integrity of motive, so liable to think that those who are opposed to him are fighting against God, that he becomes a dangerous ally, and a peculiarly exasperating opponent. So far as I have observed, the general run, even of keen politicians, greatly dislike all political parsons except those of their own way of thinking. If there is one person that exhausts the patience of an Anglican Conservative, it is a Dissenting minister on the political warpath. On the other hand, if ever the milk of human kindness dries up in the breast of a Radical Dissenter, it is at the mention of the Conservative parson and his gambols at a Primrose League Meeting. And surely to the average Protestant the spectacle of the Roman Catholic priest leading his flock to the poll, or shaking his blackthorn in the face of the hostile candidate, is not one that makes for peace and good-will. Most men in politics seem to think that the parsons *on the other side* at least would do better to mind their own work, and, if severely pressed, it would hardly be easy for them to show why their own man should not do the same.

There is often a striking contrast between the good sense and good feeling of the parson in the sphere of his pastorate, and his sweeping, unbalanced ways in the sphere of politics. Rome, Geneva, and Canterbury could furnish abundant illustrations. The mischievous exercise of political power by excellent men—divines, scholars, and saints—is "writ large" on the page of history. We have it on the authority of Lord Clarendon, quoted with approval by Mr. Stead, that the clergy are a class of men "who understand the least, and take the worst measure of human affairs, of all mankind that can read and write." I think this is an exaggeration. For myself, I should have put it far less strongly, although, when human affairs are concerned, Lord Clarendon, endorsed by Mr. Stead, is not to be lightly set aside.

Perhaps the explanation of this severe judgment is not far to seek. There is such a thing as the clerical cast of mind, which, though often ridiculed, is, I think, the legitimate product of the clerical vocation. The minister of religion is a moral and spiritual teacher, a brotherly overseer and guide, not a disputant, a debater, a man accustomed to contradiction and criticism, a giver and receiver of knocks. He is, and I venture to add, he ought to be, dogmatic in the best sense of the word, the herald and witness of truths that are not for him open or speculative questions, but Divinely given truths that have been written on his own soul by the finger of God. In his ordinary ministry he is accustomed to assume their truth. It remains for him to press their consequences and practical applications upon his hearers, and in proportion to his spiritual insight and moral weight, he will speak "as one having authority."

But when he steps across the road to make a speech for or against the Government of the day, the characteristic habit of his mind may be seen working, by no means to advantage, in another sphere, and under other conditions. He has carried with him his fervor, his fearlessness, his gift of impassioned utterance, but he uses them on questions where he has no special weight of knowledge or exceptional insight to correspond with his tone and style. His temptation is to run to superlatives, to be confident that he is entirely right and his opponents utterly wrong, to be more sweeping in his denunciations, and more unguarded in his eulogies than the veriest party hack, making the worldly-minded politician raise his eyebrows and smile inwardly, and giving occasion to Lord Clarendon and Mr. Stead to jibe at the clergy at large.

On the whole, then, I think that the parson is better out of politics. The vast majority of them would better serve the State by preaching the Gospel, and teaching the young, by visiting the sick and sorrowful, and ministering to the poor, by raising the fallen, and strengthening the tempted and weak, than by serving on political committees, attending Liberal or Conservative Associations, and making rattling speeches either for or against "Home Rule for England," "Allotments for poor clerks," "Disproportionate Representation," and the like. Questions like these may have a moral aspect, and the parson may say that nothing that concerns righteousness is indifferent to him. But there are louder calls and more obvious duties for him than these suggest. Let him attend to them.

I have not said, I do not say, that under no circumstances should a Christian minister take active part in politics. But I believe that the occasions are not many, and that the men are very few who will not do more harm than good by leaving the quiet paths of ordinary ministerial duty to take part in political life.

FREDERICK W. MACDONALD.

V.

REV. CANON WILBERFORCE.

Canon Wilberforce has contributed a letter to this discussion, replying to certain questions which we submitted to him in the following terms:

1. Do you consider that the clergy of all denominations are wise and right in interesting themselves in the great political questions of the day?
2. If your reply is in the affirmative, in what manner and to what extent do you think that they should make their influence felt?
3. Do you consider that the intervention of the clergy in politics in the past has been a blessing or otherwise in the life of the nation?
4. In your answers to the above questions, do you find it necessary to differentiate between the action of the clergy of the Established Church and the ministers of other bodies?

MY DEAR SIR,—I should reply briefly to your four questions as follows:

1. Inasmuch as "politics" are the morals of the nation, I consider that the oft-repeated aphorism, that the accredited ministers of religion overstep their functions when they actively participate in the political struggles of the time, is both shallow and mischievous. If the clergy of all denominations abstain from influencing the political life of the nation, the mainsprings of national progress are likely to become unspiritualized.

2. The extent to which their influence should be exerted will depend entirely upon circumstances, and should be in the support of principles without regard to parties.

I consider that the sacred ministry, so far from emancipating an intelligent Englishman from participating in the responsibilities of political life, accentuates his obligations as a citizen of heaven to raise his voice against State-permitted vices which tend to undermine the stability of the commonwealth; and, though he may lose popularity among lukewarm temporizers, who would prefer to hear in their pulpits echoes of their own opinions, his ministry unquestionably gains in real power if he has the courage solemnly to proclaim, even in the midst of the excitement of a contested election, the responsibility before God of the exercise of the franchise in connection with such blots upon Christian civilization as the Indian opium revenue, the demoralizing bane of the liquor traffic, the inadequate protection of the purity of women, and the oppression of weaker people, without courting the favour or shrinking from the displeasure of any political party, however powerful.

3. It is not easy to define what has and what has not been a blessing in the past life of the nation, inasmuch as the eternal purpose works behind all the multitudinous activities of national life, and in that eternal purpose all things work together for ultimate good.

4. I see no necessity for the differentiation suggested. The presence of Bishops in the House of Lords and their complete freedom to debate and vote upon every question affecting the welfare of the nation is a sufficient indication that the abstention of her ordained ministry from the political issues of the day is not the theory of the Church of England.

I am, faithfully yours,
BASIL WILBERFORCE.
Deanery, Southampton,
Dec. 3rd, 1891.

THE LATE BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE BISHOP OF RIPON.

From *The Review of the Churches* (London), December, 1891.

THE death of the Bishop of Carlisle removes from our midst one of those men of virile intellectual vigor who are not too common among us. He was a typical Cambridge man—trained to the exercise of precise and dispassionate thought, and confident of the value and importance of robust and exact methods of reasoning. It is not untrue, perhaps, to say that as his early study was in mathematics, so also the basis of his intellectual habit was mathematical too. He wrote a book of great use to a certain class of students—his Course of Mathematics. It was a careful and honest presentation of the various subjects which were required for the First Three days of the Mathematical Tripos in the good old times when the tripos was conducted in the early days of January, and in the unwarmed Senate House. The contest was as much physical as mental, and the fittest to survive were not only those who had most mathematics, but those who were impervious also to cold. The "First Three days" commenced on the Tuesday after the first day of the new year, and only those who survived the scrutiny of these three days were allowed to enter for the final agony of the remaining Five Days. To meet the requirements of the First Three days the late Bishop of Carlisle's Course of Mathematics was content. It was a welcome book to many students. But while it was useful for its purpose, and exhibited the vigor and capacity of the writer, it displayed a mind which could travel beyond the routine range of scholastic necessity.

It is the custom in some quarters to decry the value of mathematics as an intellectual training, but there are some who would fain still write over the doors of the Temple of Intellectual Life the ancient words, "Let no man ignorant of geometry enter here." The ability to grasp the significance and certainty of those universal truths which are presented in geometry is a kind of warranty against intellectual deficiency. "I will undertake," said Fred. W. Robertson, "to convict a man of idiotcy, if he cannot see the proofs that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles." A mathematical career at Cambridge as distinguished as that of Bishop Harvey Goodwin was the precursor of a life in which mental vigor was a distinguished characteristic to its latest hour.

He was not afraid of stiff problems, and he did not weary in the presence of difficult questions. His recreation was largely found in attacking hard matters, and a summer holiday was often crowned by an article on some tough subject, on which the world needed light and leading. It was in this way, if I mistake not, that some of his most useful contributions to theological literature were produced. His volume of essays, entitled "Walks in the Regions of Science and Faith," might have been called Vacation Rambles. His tract on Genesis and Creation—in its way one of the best things he ever did—was the reproduction of a lecture which was given among his own people.

The mathematical training and the scientific habit of his studies promoted that dispassionateness which lends security to reasoning. It was felt that the first thing in his mind was just the question in hand. He had no other thought, no prepossession or prejudice which warped his judgment, or predetermined the course of his argument. We know well how rare a quality this is. We all could name by the score leading writers and teachers in every age whose conclusions were reached before the argument began, and the set of whose reasoning was like a wave diverted from its course by some obstinate rock. One eminent man made it a kind of boast that he never allowed his argument to conduct him beyond a certain fixed range. There was none of this intellectual warp in Bishop Harvey Goodwin. He had too great a delight in the mental exercise to allow any conscious shift of the question in the process of the argument. There is Truth, we cannot doubt (though it does not cover the whole ground), in Professor Huxley's words "there is no alleviation for the sufferings of mankind except veracity of thought and of action, and the resolute facing of the world as it is." In so far as we can accept this statement, we must feel grateful to a man who, like the late Bishop, sturdily faced facts and problems as they were, and by his vigor and courage not only sought truth, but encouraged the faith (always precious in the world) that truth could be found and was worth the seeking. And this devotion to truth was encouraged by the dispassionateness of his intellectual habit. For it is a mistake to suppose that a vigorous determination to keep prejudice or passion out of sight in dealing with intellectual problems tends to destroy enthusiasm. Some one, indeed, said that all enthusiasts are liars, but this does not mean that truth cannot awaken enthusiasm. And what he felt to be true, Bishop Harvey Goodwin could hold with the earnestness of conviction, the strength of which was not lessened because he reasoned his way to his conclusions. He had a fund of enthusiastic sympathy with great and heroic enterprises. I remember the striking and almost vehement abruptness with which he commenced the Ramsden Sermon at Cambridge, by a reference to the preacher of the preceding year. "The Ramsden Sermon last year was preached by a man worthy of preaching it." I do not vouch for the accuracy of the words. I speak from the memory of some thirty years ago. But the remembrance of this warm and almost impetuous reference to Bishop Mackenzie has never forsaken me. It is well known that this was no passing emotion on the part of the late Bishop of Carlisle. His keen and devoted interest to the cause of the Central African Mission has long been known. One of his last letters to me was on this subject. By correspondence, by journeyings, and in other practical ways he testified the keenness of his devotion to the spread of Christian missions in that quarter of the globe which now commands an almost unrivalled interest among European nations. But Bishop Harvey Goodwin's interests began before the interest in the Dark Continent had become either fashionable or financial, because his interest was the interest of an earnest Christian man.

Neither his earnestness in a great cause, nor his strong love of argument, robbed him of his playful delight in things humorous. I can recall the almost boyish pleasure with which, at Bishopthorpe, he read aloud a comic little story which he had cut out of a newspaper. Many in Manchester will remember his amusing way of telling the workingmen the true definition of a man. The definition of man was not simply a creature with two legs—a creature, with two legs carrying a body which was practically turned into a beer barrel, was not really a man. Those who remember this dealing with the negative side of the definition will recall the happy and effective way in which he gave the positive side of the definition when he put his hand on the shoulder of the Chairman (Bishop Fraser), and turning to his audience, said, "*This* is a man." The unquestionable concrete example so well known, loved, and reverenced in Manchester, was too much for the workingmen. The cheer which rent the air was said by one who heard it to be the most magnificent cheer he had ever heard in his life.

To the warmth and vigor of his character, he added a strong practical element. This was shown in many ways, as for example when, knowing the special difficulties of Church building in his own diocese, he offered a prize for the best design of a mountain chapel. His persevering and determined work on behalf of the Church House I feel sure originated in his belief in the position of practical value which such an institution would take in the work of the Church of England.

If we follow his speeches in Convocation or in Parliament we cannot fail to notice that the practical side of questions, as a rule, were uppermost in his mind. The greater practical questions before the Church and nation were of more moment than the trifling matters of fashion or party. Even the suggestion which he made at the Lambeth Conference concerning some scheme of dogmatic teaching, though it provoked Bishop Magee's witticism that he feared we might be wrecked on the Goodwin Sands, was the outcome of his conviction that there was a practical necessity for such a plan.

It is not my object to touch upon his writings. They are all characterized by sincerity of conviction and single-mindedness of purpose. Of his work in his diocese, already much has been said, and well said. His death had a special pathos about it. To die away from home, and in the house which had already seen within the year two changes of its master, seemed to many sadly suggestive of thoughts which stir men's emotions; yet for him who is taken, though he be away from home at the final moment, the call is a call home. He died at Bishopthorpe near York. There for many years his figure had been familiar. There, at Convocation, his counsels had been valued. Thither, and on the affairs of the Church, he made his last journey. His death there was not without its fitness. He loved the Church and her work, and the opportunities which were given him for promoting and directing it. Christianity to him was no dream or speculation, but a power for practical good and for the highest benefit of man. To it, he consecrated his robust understanding, his vigorous logic, his earnest devotion. He desired to make everywhere and in every way its appeal to be heard and understood as intelligent by intelligent men. Little things are often significant of character and habit of thought, and I think that few things could better sum up the attitude of his mind than the motto which he prefixed to his last, and in some respects most considerable work, "The Foundations of the Creed," when he selected the words of Coleridge: "The Christian faith is the perfection of human intelligence."

PROBABILITY AND FAITH.

BY THE LATE BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), January, 1892.

In his volume entitled "Philomythus" Dr. Abbott has discussed, with reference to Cardinal Newman's views and experience, the connection between probability and faith regarded as guides of human life. The opening paragraph of his first chapter is as follows:

> "'Butler's doctrine that probability is the guide of life led me, at least under the teaching to which a few years later I was introduced, to the logical cogency of Faith.' So writes Newman in his 'Apologia,' and by these words he leads us to consider what is meant by probability; how far it is the guide of life; and in what way it is connected with Faith."

I have perused Dr. Abbott's volume with much attention. It appeals to me chiefly as an attempt to throw light upon the workings of Cardinal Newman's mind. In endeavoring to solve his problem Dr. Abbott has written much that has been keenly resented by some of Cardinal Newman's friends; there has been the average amount of controversy and recrimination which is to be expected in such cases. From all such controversy I desire to keep myself entirely free; but I cannot refrain from remarking that for many years the mind of Cardinal Newman, its workings and their results, have been to me a subject of deep and painful interest. I am one of those who remember well the early days of the "Tracts for the Times"; I possess the Tracts in the original edition; I read them when they came fresh upon the minds of Englishmen; I had taken my degree before the appearance of No. XC. Nay more; I am one of those—not so many of them now—who have heard Newman preach in his own pulpit of St. Mary's, Oxford, and who can bear testimony to the marvellous effect of his preaching and the marvellous manner in which it was produced. Those who never heard him can scarcely believe—so at least I have found—that pulpit eloquence could be supported upon such a foundation: the unvarying note, the absolute immobility of face and limb, the close of a long sentence to be followed by another apparently separated from the preceding one by a sharp fracture; all this does not look much like a true basis for pulpit eloquence—and in a certain sense it was not eloquence; nevertheless in a very real and deep sense it was so; it was like a message from another world, or like an utterance of a primitive saint or martyr permitted to revisit the world of living men.

I am speaking of the impression made upon me half a century ago, when I visited Oxford partly for the sake of seeing the University, and partly for the sake of hearing Newman. A sermon which I heard him preach is contained in one of his published volumes; it is entitled "The Incarnate Son: a Sufferer and a Sacrifice."* It is, I think, in his best style; but those who read it as printed, and who never heard Newman preach, can have no conception of the sublime, awful solemnity which was imparted to it as a living utterance by his unearthly manner of delivery.

I could write much more in the tone of the preceding paragraph were it necessary; but my purpose will have been accomplished if the account which I have given of my feeling of interest in Newman, and of the effect produced upon my mind by his preaching, enables me to say, without suspicion of any wish to do him injustice, that I never found his utterances capable of carrying conviction to my mind. That remarkable sermon, of which I have already spoken as having been heard by myself at Oxford and which any one can read for himself, appeared to me then, and appears still, to depend for its power upon a pervading fallacy. The fallacy is this, that in virtue of our Lord's divinity, we may rightly substitute the phrase *Almighty God* for the phrase *Jesus Christ* wherever our Lord's doings or sufferings are made the subject of narration or discussion; a process which opens up an immeasurable field for solemn rhetoric, but is likely to bring us within measurable distance of patripassianism. The result upon my mind in listening to the sermon was consequently as far from conviction as possible. And that which was true concerning the sermon in question is for me true also concerning Newman's writings as a whole,—full of striking thoughts, poetical passages, holy aspirations, conveyed in faultless English; but (so far as my experience is concerned) wanting in the primest of all qualities—namely, the power of conviction; a kind of phantasmagoria of thought, not corresponding to facts and conclusions which calm reflection enables an unbiassed mind to accept as real. Let me take, as an example of what I mean, a sentence which was said, when it was uttered in St. Mary's, to have produced a tremendous vibration through the whole mind of Oxford. Here is the passage:

---

* "Parochial Sermons," vol. vi., Sermon vi.

> "Scripture says that the sun moves, and the earth is stationary, and science that the earth moves, and the sun is comparatively at rest. How can we determine which of these opposite statements is the very truth, till we know what motion is? If our idea of motion is but an accidental result of our present senses, neither proposition is true, and both are true; neither true philosophically, both true for certain practical purposes in the system in which they are respectively found; and physical science will have no better meaning when it says that the earth moves than plane astronomy when it says that the earth is still." *

I think it would be difficult to concentrate in one short passage more error and confusion of thought than this contains; and the suggestion of a bottomless universal scepticism which it contains is frightful exceedingly. Newman perceived this himself, and adds in the next paragraph:

> "Should any one fear lest thoughts such as these should tend to a dreary, hopeless scepticism, let him take into account the Being and Providence of God, the Merciful and True, and he will at once be relieved of his anxiety."

But it would be beyond my purpose to discuss it fully. I quote it as an extreme specimen of a style which, while susceptible of remarkable impressiveness, and perhaps appearing for the moment to contain deep and important truth, reveals itself, on reflection, as resting on no foundation of solid reason, and as incapable therefore of producing permanent conviction. May it not be said, in fact, that this want of power of conviction has been felt by many to be a characteristic of Newman's life and teaching? We speak of him with regard, respect, affection, almost without reference to schools of thought; we print "Lead, kindly Light" in all our hymn-books, whether "Ancient and Modern," "Hymnal Companion," Society for the Promoting Christian Knowledge, or what not. When the Cardinal departed this life there was something like a national sorrow, and yet how many Englishmen have practically followed his leading? How many have felt the English Church unsound and unsafe in virtue of these arguments which led him to desert her? What are they who followed him, as compared with the multitude who have recognized all that was beautiful in his character and remarkable in his intellectual powers, and who have sorrowed over him as one who left a grand post of spiritual influence, from which it seemed possible that he might have moved the world, in order to adopt a position against which in his best days no one had protested more strongly than himself?*

I must not, however, permit myself to expatiate further on the subject of Cardinal Newman and the character of his preaching, and the like. The purpose of the remarks already made is chiefly that of indicating my own mental position, and of eschewing all hostile feeling toward one who by general assent must be regarded as one of the most remarkable Englishmen of the century, and whom many would regard it as no exaggeration to describe as emphatically a great man. Having written what seemed to me to be necessary with this view, I now return to the passage from the "Apologia" with which Dr. Abbott opens his first chapter.

Newman speaks of "Butler's doctrine

---

* "Sermons on the Theory of Religious Belief," Sermon xiv.

* To contrast Newman for one moment with his great contemporary, F. D. Maurice, my experience in reading the works of the two men was, that whereas Newman produced upon my mind something like the pleasure which results from looking at a picture or other work of art, Maurice seemed to flash out beams of light which penetrated to the soul. The chief debt which I feel to be due from myself to Newman, and I imagine from others, is for his inculcation of those views concerning the spiritual and historical status of the English Church, which unfortunately he subsequently repudiated.

that probability is the guide of life." The first question that suggests itself is perhaps this, whether indeed this is Butler's doctrine. It is true that with the addition of one word the phrase "probability is the guide of life" may be found in the introduction to the "Analogy." I say, with the addition of one word, because the actual language of Butler is "probability is the *very* guide of life." I am not sure that in quoting the passage we have any right to change "the *very* guide" into "*the* guide"; and I express this doubt because the latter reading appears to me to give a much more absolute character to the dictum than that which attaches to Butler's actual words. If in every-day experience I use the expression concerning something which has come to my hand, "This is the very thing I wanted," it would perhaps be regarded as an unfair interpretation of the phrase if it should be regarded as stamping the thing in question with a unique character of adaptation to my needs. Upon this point, however, I shall not lay particular stress. There is another view of the matter which seems to me much more important.

Every reader of the "Analogy" knows that the force of the argument which Butler sums up in the assertion that "probability is the very guide of life" is to be found in the appeal which he makes to unbelievers to act in the high concerns of religion upon the principles which they adopt in common affairs. A man, with whom Butler conceives himself to be arguing, says, "I will not believe in the reality of a future life, and will make no preparation for it, unless you can prove to me in a manner not to be doubted or gainsaid that the future life is a reality." Butler replies, "This is not the principle upon which you act in common things. You act every day upon probable evidence. Human affairs would come to a deadlock if men would never consent to act upon anything short of actual proof." Every one must feel the force of this argument, and if Butler in his introduction summarizes it by saying that probability is the very guide of life, I think it is a misinterpretation of his language if we regard him as laying down a general rule with regard not only to mundane, but to spiritual matters, and as asserting that we are to take probability as the guide of our spiritual life to the exclusion of all other guides.

It seems clear from Newman's own words that he adopted what I have ventured to call a misinterpretation of Butler's language, and that he regarded the change involved in the relinquishment of probability as the guide of life and the adoption of faith in its stead as one of first-rate magnitude, and as supplying the key to much of his spiritual history; anyhow, it is undeniable that Newman has placed probability and faith in antithetic relation to each other, and has thus suggested a problem which it may be interesting to attempt to solve. What do we mean by probability? in what sense can it be regarded as the guide of life? and in what relation does it stand to faith? Whether probability is to be regarded as the guide of life or not, it is on either supposition desirable to be clear in our minds as to the real meaning of the word.

Before discussing this question, however, let me interpolate a few words of qualification to the general phrase that probability is the guide of life. Certain remarks made by Dr. Abbott suggest to me the necessity of doing so. The qualification is this: probability must be, and is in practice cheerfully accepted as, our guide *when certainty cannot be had.* We assume as certain that the sun will rise according to a regular law, because a long induction and also careful scientific investigation make it practically quite certain that it will do so. If I say that I regard probability as the guide of life, and you ask me, What about the rising of the sun to-morrow? do you make your arrangements for to-morrow upon the mere probability that the sun will rise?—the answer is, No, I do not need probability as my guide in this case; I enjoy practical certainty, and therefore do not need probability. A man who has the full use of his limbs does not need a stick; a man who knows his way does not need to look at a sign-post, though he might consistently speak of sign-posts as useful guides. It may be possible that a large number of a man's actions may be guided by a sense of practical certainty, and yet there must be some in which such practical certainty is unattainable; it is in these cases that he is guided by probability. A man sends his son to a public school, having made the most careful inquiries in his power, and he hopes the best for his boy's future, on grounds of probability; he crosses the ocean in a vessel which he believes to be good and trustworthy, but he knows that the best of vessels is liable to accident, and that he has no certainty as to the result of his voyage; he engages a house, having first inquired as to its sanitary condition, but he knows from common experience that the health of his family rests only on a probability. In these and such like ways probability constantly comes into every man's calculations as to what it is best and wisest for him to do; but it is in cases in which certainty cannot be had. To omit this manifestly necessary qualification is to destroy the meaning of Butler's aphorism.

Now let us consider more carefully what is meant by probability. The word appears to be capable of three senses, which may be termed the original, the popular, and the scientific. These shall be considered in order.

First, then, with regard to the original meaning. In Richardson's Dictionary we find the following explanation of the word *probable:* "That can be proved, demonstrable." But there is added this remark: "*Probable*, by usage, is now distinguished from *demonstrable.*" It may perhaps even be said that by usage *probable* has come to mean almost the reverse of *demonstrable;* we describe a thing which we fancy we have some reason to believe as *probable,* when we cannot demonstrate that it is true. I come home from a walk in London, and find my handkerchief not in my pocket: it is, of course, probable that the pocket was picked, but it cannot be proved that this was actually so; it is conceivable that the handkerchief was dropped by accident; it may, on the other hand, perhaps, be regarded as nearly certain that the case was one of theft; still, if no one saw the theft committed and no evidence is forthcoming in the case except the loss of the handkerchief, it is clear that in saying it is probable that the handkerchief was stolen we reverse the original meaning of the word *probable,* and use it to signify that the fact to which it is applied is incapable of demonstration, not that it is demonstrable.

Usage has, in fact, deprived the word *probability* completely of its original meaning—that is, the meaning which the construction of the word suggests—and therefore we may pass without hesitation to the second meaning, which I have described as the popular. The word *probable* or *probability,* as popularly used, may be said to express that, to the mind of a certain person or the minds of certain persons, a certain thing is regarded as likely to be true, without reference to the grounds on which the conclusion is based or the degree of confidence with which the thing is believed. Different minds have different estimates of probability. An elderly man and a little child walking in the highway encounter a beggar, who tells a lamentable tale of misery afflicting him and his family. The little child believes the story at once; the elderly man shakes his head, and says he will make some inquiry. Some persons accept marvellous tales without effort; upon others they make no impression. Education, temperament, experience, and the like produce enormous differences in the estimates which different men make of probability; and I suppose that the task performed by a judge in summing up a case to a jury consists very much in putting the evidence—conflicting evidence, it may be—in such a manner before simple, untrained minds, as to enable them to estimate aright the probabilities of the case. In most cases that come before a judge and jury, demonstration is impossible; what the judge can do is to clear the case of any false gloss put upon evidence by advocates on either side; to point out what has been proved and what has not been proved; and it may then be taken as tolerably sure that a unanimous conclusion of twelve simple, honest, unprejudiced men will be a true verdict.

It may be worth while to quote again from Richardson. The popular meaning, according to this authority, is as follows: "That may be reasonably expected to be, or happen to be; having a likelihood, or resemblance, or similarity to truth or reality; a verisimilitude." This, no doubt, is a somewhat loose definition; but in reality the definition of probability must be, if not loose, at least capable of being loosened; it must admit of degrees. Probability may vary from the merest chance to something nearly approaching certainty. If I walk across a street in London, the probability of being run over by a carriage may be as nearly as possible inappreciable, the probability of getting safe to the other side may be as near certainty as possible.

It is in this popular sense, if in any, that Butler's dictum concerning probability as the very guide of life ought to be construed. I shall have to speak presently of the third meaning of the word *probability*—namely, the scientific; but I will anticipate my remarks so far as to say that I regard the popular, not the scientific, meaning to be that which in ordinary life is generally applicable; if the application of Butler's dictum involved the necessity of scientific calculation, the case would be hopeless for the large majority of mankind. No one in fact thinks, in the ordinary affairs of life, of calculating probabilities; and yet every day we have to act as if certain things were true which we should have much difficulty in proving.

Take a simple example. Almost every

man believes, and acts upon the belief, that he is the lawful child of certain persons commonly reputed to be his parents. It would be a terrible thing for society if belief without proof were not held by the world at large, and felt by each individual in his own case to be sufficient in such a matter. For indeed, if proof were wanted, it might be—nay, it would be, in the very nature of things—difficult to produce. Experience teaches us that this is so. Sometimes it becomes necessary, as when a peerage or a property is involved, to prove that a certain person is what he professes and believes himself to be. A court of law may be engaged for weeks in trying such an issue, and the result may not be free from doubt after all. May it not be held and asserted that in such a case probability is the very guide of life? Could society hold together without a recognition of probability instead of proof? It is not that a man's parentage is admitted to be doubtful, and yet that on the whole he is entitled to the benefit of the doubt—this would be intolerable: the true view would seem to be, that in a matter of the highest social importance, society agrees silently but absolutely to an unwritten law, which substitutes probability for proof.

The remarks which have just been made seem to contain the solution of a difficulty which Dr. Abbott expresses in these words:

> "In attempting to apply his doctrine of *probability as the guide of life* to belief in God and in divine truths, Newman confesses that he met a difficulty. How could a man pray to a *probable* God, or pray to God upon grounds of probability?" *

The difficulty appears formidable or not—to me at least it is so—according to the meaning which we attach to the word probable. It is very formidable, or more than formidable, if we mean by probable that a proposition so described is an absolutely open question. Take the case of the existence of intelligent beings upon the surface of the planets. It is certainly probable—that is to say, many substantial arguments may be alleged to show—that such inhabitants exist. On the other hand, the late Dr. Whewell, a man of high intellectual and philosophical qualifications, wrote a volume on the opposite side of the question. Consequently, it must be conceded that such existence is doubtful, and it is certain that no practical conclusion would be admitted by thoughtful men which depended upon the assumption of its truth. Or again, without anticipating what I shall have to say upon the scientific meaning of probability, it may be granted that if by the phrase "a probable God" it is intended to express that it is ten to one, or a hundred to one, or what not, that God exists, while there is an appreciable probability that there is no God at all, it would be difficult to enter into spiritual relations with such a doubtful Being by prayer or otherwise. In fact, if the claims of our God and heavenly Father were based upon such a claim as this —"The chances are considerably in favor of His existence, therefore bend your knees in admiration on peril of incurring His displeasure"—I should quite expect that men of high feeling and well-balanced minds would honestly and solemnly refuse to have anything to do with this hypothetical God. But if by the phrase "a probable God" is meant an infinite Being whose existence is not susceptible of a certain kind of demonstration, but at the same time does not seem to require it, the supposed difficulty in praying to Him may be said to vanish. We might as well speak of the difficulty of honoring and obeying a probable father or mother; yet in the strict sense of the phrase this is done every day—that is to say, children honor parents when they cannot *demonstrate* parentage. Do we not all feel that this is right, wise, necessary? Does not society rest upon the assumption that men and women are, except in rare and special cases, that which they are supposed to be? And if so, may it not be maintained that the human soul acts according to a true instinct in praying to God, even though philosophers cannot produce an irrefragable proof of His being? When the term *probability* is applied to the Divine existence, I should hold that in one sense of the term the application is infinitely right, and in another sense infinitely wrong. It is not that believers in God can say that they have reason to think that it is a hundred to one or a thousand to one that God exists, while unbelievers admit perhaps a probability, but a much smaller one, and think that upon the whole the chance is the other way, so that the being of God may be set aside without appreciable danger—not this, nor anything like this, would seem to me to be a possible or tolerable view of the case; rather it should be insisted that the whole conception indicated by such language is thoroughly and fundamentally wrong, as wrong as it would be to speak of the probability of honesty being the best policy, or of the probability of truth being better than falsehood. An allegation may be true, yet it may be impossible in a certain sense to prove its truth; it may in fact need no proof; nevertheless it may be an utter mistake to describe it as only probable.

---

* "Philomythus," chap. ii. p. 57.

And here perhaps it may be right to quote at some length from the introduction to the "Analogy." The dictum that "probability is the very guide of life" is, as has been already observed, merely a sentence in that introduction. If we would understand Bishop Butler fully, it is well to ponder the following passage, and to observe how distinctly the argument concerning probability is an *argumentum ad hominem*, a plea for the adoption in higher concerns of a principle which in ordinary life is one of necessity:

> "From these things it follows [writes Bishop Butler] that in questions of difficulty, or such as are thought so, when more satisfactory evidence cannot be had, or is not seen, if the result of the examination be that there appears upon the whole any the lowest presumption on one side and none on the other, or a greater presumption on one side though in the lowest degree greater, this determines the question, even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice, will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and interest, to act upon that presumption or low probability, though it be so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the truth. For surely a man is as really bound in prudence to do what upon the whole appears, according to the best of his judgment, to be for his happiness, as what he certainly knows to be so. Nay, further, in questions of great consequence, a reasonable man will think it concerns him to remark lower probabilities and presumptions than these; such as amount to no more than showing one side of a question to be as supposable and as credible as the other: nay, such as but amount to much less even than this. For numberless instances might be mentioned respecting the common pursuits of life, where a man would be thought, in a literal sense, distracted, who would not act, and with great application too, not only upon an even chance, but upon much less, and where the probability or chance was greatly against his succeeding."

I confess that after making every allowance for the circumstances in which Bishop Butler wrote, and for the peculiar character of his argument, I cannot feel surprised if this view of probability in connection with high spiritual concerns should produce upon serious and religious minds somewhat of a feeling of repulsion. It is well enough to speak of probability as applicable to the common pursuits of life, and even in the case of higher things the argument may become in the strong hands of a Butler a kind of *malleus infidelium;* but it contrasts somewhat painfully with the language of Him who said, "Come unto Me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." It has the same kind of fault as that which attaches to Pascal's challenge to unbelievers, "the *pariez vous*," over which I remember that Frederick Maurice drops a bitter tear of sadness in one of his books, though I cannot readily turn to the passage. The being of God, the future life of man, the truth of that which men like Pascal have believed concerning this world and the world to come, is no proper subject for a bet; and that, not merely because betting is mischievous in itself or a practice to be avoided in all times and places, but because in subjects of this kind the data of betting are wanting, and the mere suggestion of a bet, though nothing could be further from Pascal's mind, drags the subject down from the high region of pure light into a lower region of mist and darkness.

Nevertheless, there is an immeasurable difference between reminding a man who stickles for proof of a demonstrative kind in matters spiritual, that he habitually acts without such proof in the ordinary affairs of daily life, and regarding Butler as having laid down the maxim "probability is the guide of life" as the proper and sufficient guide of the human soul in its pilgrimage through this present world. This is what Cardinal Newman at one period of his life seems to have done; and this is what I apprehend Bishop Butler never intended that any reader of his great work should do.

But it is time that I should pass on to discuss the third meaning of the term *probability*—namely, the scientific. I lay the more stress upon this meaning of the term, because (as it appears to me) in speaking of probability there is a great danger in using language which is only properly intelligible on the supposition of its being used scientifically in matters to which in its scientific sense the word *probability* cannot be properly applied. I quote in illustration a passage from "Philomythus":

> "He himself (Cardinal Newman), when Christianity is in question, imperiously calls upon us to go upon probabilities, even though they be little more than evenly balanced, and once told us that we cannot be Christians, 'if we will not go by evidence, in which there are (so to say) *three* chances for revelation, and only *two* against.'"

Dr. Abbott adds, in a note, "In a later text, Newman substituted a *dozen* for *three*," and he comments upon the recklessness of such substitution; but the fundamental error is (if I am not mistaken) in the application of any notion of numerically measured probability to such a subject as that of the truth of our holy religion, or indeed of any religion. Even the language of Butler on this subject seems to me to be sometimes open to objection, as where he speaks of "an even chance." Perhaps, therefore, a short discussion of the scientific meaning of probability may be useful in clearing away a confusion which to some minds may exist on the subject.

I imagine that some persons are not aware that problems of probability belong to the highest department of mathematics. Laplace's "Calcul des Probabilités" takes rank as one of the most remarkable efforts of one of the most remarkable of mathematicians. Every mathematician, even of the humblest powers, is familiar with the notion of calculating the probability of events. The possibility of this may be made clear to any ordinary mind. Take a very simple example: What is the probability of drawing a particular card—say, the ace of diamonds—out of a pack? There are fifty-one cards which will not answer the conditions of the problem; there is only one that will. Consequently, it is fifty-one to one against drawing the specified card. What is really meant is, that if you shuffle and draw a very large number of times—say 52,000—the ace of diamonds will be the card drawn 1000 times; in fact, each card in the pack will be drawn the same number of times, there being no reason why one should be drawn more than another. It will be seen from this simple case how the calculation of the probability of an event may be mathematically made, and how in the long run probability becomes certainty.

But there is another form of probability which depends upon combination of events. To take a simple example: Suppose four coins are thrown upon the table at random, what is the probability in favor of the coins turning up three heads and one tail? A little consideration will show that there are five different ways in which the coins can fall: all heads, all tails, one head, two heads, and three heads: only one of these answers the condition; consequently, it is four to one against the specified combination; in other words, if we threw the coins a very large number of times the desired event would happen once in five times.

I will mention just one more problem, the solution of which is of a complicated kind, and cannot be given here. Suppose I write half a dozen letters and address half a dozen envelopes, and then put the lettters into the envelopes at haphazard, what is the probability that each person will receive the letter intended for him? or, on the other hand, what is the probability that they will all go wrong?

In cases such as these, it will be apparent that probability has a distinct mathematical meaning, and that to speak of a certain possible event as having a probability of three to one, or a hundred to one, or what not, is to use language in a strictly defined sense. It would be impossible for an author who considered this, in one edition of a book to write "*three* chances for revelation and only *two* against," and then in a subsequent edition to substitute "a dozen" for "three." It would be just as possible to say in one edition of a book that there were seven days in a week, and in another that there were ten. This must be at once granted as soon as it is understood that probability is used in a scientific sense; and if it be pleaded that the word is used in a popular and not in a scientific sense, then I should claim that the conclusions should not be stated in scientific language—that is to say, in numbers (for numbers are in their very nature scientific)—for this is sure to mislead. It is probable that a certain manuscript was written in the fourth century. This is an intelligible statement. To say that it is five to one that it was so written, unless some special ground is alleged for these odds, is to say that which is unintelligible in any strict and definite sense.

There is another class of problems in probability to which attention should be directed—namely, those which depend upon statistics. For example, an office undertakes to insure against a certain contingency, a fire, or a railway accident; or it undertakes to pay a certain sum of money to a man's executors on the occasion of his death. Transactions of this kind, as every one knows, are not mere gambling. They depend upon observation and results deduced from observation. Tables of mortality, constructed from observation, enable experts to determine the probable duration of life, and therefore to say upon what terms it will be safe to engage to pay a hundred pounds to his executors. Of course, with a small number of insurers an office might come to grief; but with a large number the results will be quite certain to be those which are given by the calculated tables; that which would be chance in the case of twenty persons would be practical certainty with twenty thousand. The same kind of remark applies to fire and accident. Experience shows how often fires or accidents in given circumstances take place, and though it may be more difficult to obtain accurate statistics than in the case of death, still the principle is the same, and it is manifest that chance tends more and more, as you extend your experience over longer times and wider areas, to become certainty, and that it is possible for offices to conduct insurance upon sound mathematical principles.

There is another class of subjects to which it has been attempted to extend scientific reasoning within the limits of the general subject of probabilities, to which reference ought to be made—namely, that of legal evidence and judgments founded upon it. This involves much more difficult questions than those of statistics, because the questions are moral, and therefore not so easily reduced to numbers. I am not sure whether the learned works which have been written are regarded by lawyers as having practically advanced the task of duly administering justice. I will make one reference, however, to Poisson's great work, " Sur la Probabilité des Jugements," in order to show how much difficulty there is in applying scientific considerations to subjects of this class.

According to Condorcet, writes Poisson, the chance of a man being condemned unjustly should be equivalent to that of a danger which we regard as so small that we should not care to avoid it in our ordinary course of life ; and this on the ground that society has the right, for its own protection, to expose one of its members to a danger, which (so to speak) he himself regards with indifference. This consideration, however, continues our writer, is much too subtle for so grave a question. Laplace gives a definition, much more calculated to throw light upon the question of the chance of mistake which we are compelled to admit into criminal judgments. According to him, this probability ought to be such that there will be greater danger to public safety arising from the acquittal of a guilty man than fear of the condemnation of an innocent one.*

Either of these views may probably be maintained with a great amount of argument ; possibly both may be in a certain sense true ; but whatever view we take, the opinion may perhaps be rightly expressed that the question is one of almost purely academic interest. In determining the guilt or innocence of a prisoner, judge and jury must have simple principles on which to proceed : the verdict of guilty is given, because the evidence produced leaves practically no doubt upon the minds of the judge and jury that the charge against the prisoner is true. I do not apprehend that it would be possible to take into consideration such general principles as those enunciated either by Condorcet or Laplace ; and if the case should be one in which figures were possible, and an expert could prove that it was ninety-nine to one against the prisoner, I imagine that the judge would direct the jury to give the prisoner the benefit of the doubt. In fact, in moral questions, whether of criminal accusation or of religious truth, the popular meaning of probability, rather than the scientific one, is that which must guide our judgment.

I have entitled this article " Probability and Faith," and I now propose to offer some remarks upon faith in connection with probability. The two things are placed in an antithetical relation to each other by Cardinal Newman in the words quoted from the " Apologia" in the opening of the article. He says that Butler's doctrine that probability is the guide of life led him to the logical cogency of faith. I am not intending to discuss the manner in which this progress took place, nor to follow Dr. Abbott in his examination of Newman's account of his own spiritual history, but I wish to state at once, and plainly, the point which strikes my mind as the most salient with respect to the arguments of both writers. I do not perceive how probability can be separated from faith, or faith from probability. I am not sure that the phrase above quoted, " the logical cogency of faith," is one which can be maintained as correct. You may speak of the logical cogency of an argument, but faith, in the very nature of things, is not argument. Faith is subjective ; argument —and probability, which is of the same nature as argument—are objective. Faith is the action of the mind itself, accepting as truth that which it thinks it has good reason to accept as true, though it cannot actually prove the same. Probability is a quality which attaches to an allegation, whether the mind accepts it or not. Faith depends upon temperament, education, previous experience, and other influences. For example, there is a report in the newspapers of some political event—the result of a contested election, the resignation of a Minister, a complication with some foreign Government. Roughly speaking, you may say that one political party will believe the report, and the other will discredit it. Neither will say that the thing reported is impossible, or capable of disproof, or perhaps even violently improbable ; but wishes which are fathers to thoughts, or habitual modes of looking at things, or the distortions of prejudice, produce their effects upon the judgment, and affect the power of belief.

The question, however, which I have to

---

* I have not Poisson's book at hand ; but I quote from a paper by the late Sergeant Joyce, in the " Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society."

consider is whether probability and faith can be properly separated from each other, and contemplated as two different modes of arriving at religious truth. As I understand Cardinal Newman, he lived for a time upon what is described as Butler's doctrine that "probability is the guide of life," and that, finding this doctrine unsatisfactory, he discarded probability and took faith as his guide instead. Now it would be foolish for any Christian writer to disparage the power and value of faith. Without adopting extreme Lutheran views on the subject, it is obvious that no spiritual agency receives, throughout the whole of the New Testament, whether in the Gospels, or in the Acts of the Apostles, or in the Epistles, more complete recognition than faith. Our Lord's frequent declarations as to the power of faith to obtain boons from Himself, even when the action is vicarious, as when the friends of a sick man brought the sufferer, himself being helpless, into His presence; or to perform miracles, as when He said that a disciple having faith as a grain of mustard-seed might cast a mountain into the sea,—all these reiterated declarations are in entire keeping with all that was written afterward by the Apostles, when they had time, as it were, to form a code of Christian theology; notably they are in accordance with the declaration of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Indeed, it seems strange that a thoughtful, religious man and a divine should be so long, as Newman seems to have been, in discovering the large share which belongs to faith in the conduct of the Christian life. Perhaps the explanation is to be found in the phrase "logical cogency of faith," a phrase concerning the correctness of which I have already ventured to express a doubt; but however this may be, I would lay stress upon this point—that the office of faith should be to throw life into that which already is perceived to be probable. Faith cannot float (so to speak) entirely in the air; it must have some foundation upon which to rest; and if it is to be anything different from fanaticism and enthusiasm, it must have some ground of probability upon which to stand. The prayer in the Gospel: "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief," seems to express as well as can be desired the true character and basis of faith.

It is true, no doubt, that in a certain sense faith gets rid of probability. A matured faith enables a man to say, like St. Paul, "I know in whom I have believed"; and doubtless, when a believer makes his prayer to God, he does not think of Him as a probable God; nor does a disciple of Christ when speaking to other disciples, or when meditating by himself, like Thomas à Kempis, consider the evidence upon which he accepts Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ of God; but the probability must be assumed, the evidence must be taken for granted; the moment you begin to talk about logical cogency, arguments and probabilities must come to the front; as long as the sky is serene and the mind is filled with thoughts of love and devotion, so long faith may be content to forget the ground upon which she rests; but when the storm comes, whatever be the cause of the disturbance, it will have to be considered whether faith has a real ground upon which to rest secure, or whether it resolves itself into a dream.

For, after all, the great question with regard to such doctrines as the being of God, the Divine character of Jesus Christ, the reality of a life to come, must be whether they are probable or not. It may be admitted that such doctrines are incapable of demonstration in the strict sense of the word; but are they probable in the highest degree? Are they of a kind to justify a man who believes them in recommending them to others on the ground of reason and calm judgment? I put on one side all consideration of the probability of the truth of those ecclesiastical miracles concerning which Cardinal Newman took so much trouble, and which have given rise to Dr. Abbott's book; I do not think it is absolutely necessary for a Catholic Christian to hold a strong opinion about them. I confine my thoughts to great cardinal verities, and concerning them it is not in my judgment derogatory to their high character to conclude that they are *probably true*—in the proper sense of the phrase; and that they so commend themselves to the human soul that it is possible for an earnest man to say, as many have said, "I am as sure as I can be of anything which does not admit of actual demonstration that these things in very deed *are* true." The office of faith is, I apprehend, not to disparage probability, but to change the mere otiose acceptance of a story or a doctrine as probably true, into a firm and perhaps ever-growing conviction that the story or doctrine contains the revealed truth of God.

And hence the general conclusion at which I arrive, and which it is the purpose of this article to recommend and enforce, is this, that probability and faith have been joined together by God, and must not be in any way put asunder. Probability exists in the nature of things. Outside the range of mathematics there are few truths which rest upon irrefragable, indubitable proof. In the whole moral department of human thought there is scarcely a proposition which has not been doubted, and which may not be questioned. In natural science and in history the probable is often the nearest approximation to truth which can be made by the most earnest and most conscientious student. And we reconcile ourselves to the toleration of the probable; we constantly grope towards the light; but we are content to leave much in darkness. It is only when we deal with the highest of all subjects that imperfect knowledge becomes, at least to some minds, intolerable; it is the very mark of man's high spiritual constitution that this should be so. The dissatisfaction with imperfect knowledge, the possibility of doubt with regard to subjects of supreme interest to the human soul, may be perhaps permitted to grow to excess and to become morbid; nevertheless the language of the patriarch, "Oh, that I knew where I might find Him, that I might come into His presence," expresses the feeling of a healthy soul, and seems to commend itself as an inspiration from Him by whom the soul was created; and it is to the soul thus labouring under the combined influence of aspiration after God and dissatisfaction with the evidence of His living presence supplied by probability intellectually considered, that faith commends itself as the spiritual agency required. Faith as a grain of mustard-seed can move mountains; but it must be faith combined with reason, resting upon grounds which an honest mind can approve, otherwise it may be only another name for fanaticism and folly. A rational acceptance of the probable, accompanied or rather inspired by a divine element of faith, may be regarded as constituting the higher life of man, somewhat as body and soul combine to constitute humanity. Each needs the other, and it is when the two co-exist and cooperate without friction or interference that health and happiness result.

THE BOOK OF LAMENTATIONS.

BY REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.

From *The Expositor* (London), January, 1892.

Of all the poetical books of the Old Testament this is probably the one least generally known; yet it is the one about which our information is most complete. About the circumstances in which some of these books were produced we know little or nothing; we cannot fix their dates with certainty to within hundreds of years. But we can tell precisely the circumstances in which this book arose; and we can fix its date to within, at the most, a year or two; some think to within a month or two.*

In the year 588 B.C. the city of Jerusalem was compassed round by the Babylonians, and, after a siege of two years, during which the inhabitants endured all the extremities of such a situation, it fell into the hands of the enemy, who burnt it to the ground and transported the inhabitants, a few excepted, to far off Babylon. Those who stayed behind attempted to organize themselves in the empty country. But they were attacked in their weakness by the predatory tribes which lived on the borders, and so harassed, that at last, panic-stricken and demoralised, they set off for Egypt, to seek refuge there.

The book has for its theme this catastrophe of the holy nation, and especially of the holy city; and it is evident that it was written at the time by one who was an eye-witness of the scenes he depicts and felt to the very depths of his soul the horror and pain of the tragedy.†

There is one man well-known to us who was on the spot during all these events. The prophet Jeremiah had foretold for many years that this calamity was coming upon Jerusalem. But he spoke to deaf ears. The false prophets by whom he was surrounded made light of his warnings and maintained that he was entirely mistaken: the city of Jehovah would never be given over into the hands of the heathen. The people were only too ready to listen to these flatterers; and the heads of the community were so irritated by what they considered Jeremiah's pessimistic croaking, that they shut his mouth by casting him into prison.

It turned out, however, that he was a true prophet; and he lived to see the fulfilment of the worst which he had foretold. He was in Jerusalem all through the siege and the subsequent destruction of the city; and, after the transportation of the inhabitants had taken place, he was among the small remnant who stayed for a time in the country. He resisted the migration to Egypt, but was compelled at last to go with the rest.

It is very natural to suppose that he was the author, therefore, of the book. This, no doubt, is why it is separated in our Bible from the rest of the poetical books and inserted after Jeremiah's prophecy. In the Septuagint it is introduced with the superscription: "And it came to pass, after Israel was led into captivity, and Jerusalem laid waste, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said." These words, however, do not occur in the Hebrew, which nowhere gives the name of the author.

---

* Bleek argues that it was written between the surrender and the destruction of the city.

† Ewald contends that it was written after the fugitives arrived in Egypt, and was used at a mournful anniversary celebration.

Jeremiah has always been supposed to be the author till the present day, when it is the fashion to suppose a new author wherever there is the faintest pretext for doing so.* The reasons which have been discovered for attributing Lamentations to another author are of the most microscopic order; but they have appeared sufficient to a certain school. It is allowed, however, that the writer lived at the same time as Jeremiah, and went through the same experience. Bunsen made the suggestion that he may have been Baruch, Jeremiah's loved disciple.

The question is of comparatively little interest, and it has no religious importance whatever. It would be gratifying to know that besides Jeremiah there was another gifted son of Israel in those days, who loved Zion with an affection as profound as is displayed in this book, and was able to express in such lasting literary form the meaning of these tragic events. Nature is hardly, however, so prodigal of her gifts.

The genius of Jeremiah was a rare and peculiar one; but it could not be better expressed than in the profound impression made on the heart of the writer of this book by his country's calamities and the profoundly religious view which he takes of the situation. It is also a noteworthy circumstance that we know from other Scripture that Jeremiah was a lament-writer. Of course a man might be a prophet without having the peculiar gift of the poet. But Jeremiah not only wrote poetry, but this kind of poetry; he wrote a lament on the death of Josiah.† There are some peculiarities in the language of the Lamentations which do not occur in Jeremiah's prophecy; but this is no more than might be expected, when a writer was passing from one species of literature to another;* and, on the other hand, there are many striking resemblances, and among them one or two phrases which are so characteristic of Jeremiah's style, that they may almost be called his cipher. By far the most conclusive proof, however, of the authorship is the account of Jeremiah's personal experience given in the third chapter. Here the facts of the prophet's history are described with autobiographic fulness. And who but Jeremiah could have used the opening words of that great chapter, "I am the man that hath seen affliction"? Only some prominent public character could have ventured to apply such a description to himself; and whom does the grandiose phrase fit so well as the typical sufferer of his age?†

The form of this book is of course poetical. But there are certain peculiarities in its poetry which deserve to be noted.

The book is not a continuous poem, but a collection of five separate pieces, all of the same character, and all on the same theme. And the book is so divided in our version that each poem just fills a chapter.

The poems belong to the elegiac species of poetry; and we should call the separate pieces elegies, or dirges, or laments. This kind of poetry seems to have been much cultivated in Israel. We find in the Bible not a few other laments besides those of Jeremiah. They appear to have been frequently composed on the death of persons prominent in the public eye or beloved by a large circle of acquaintance; and very likely they were sung in connection with the funeral rites. But they might also be composed in commemoration of public calamities; and there are some very remarkable prophetic laments, predicting the destruction of cities with the accompanying scenes of woe.‡

But there is a remarkable peculiarity still to be mentioned in these laments of Jeremiah. The first four of them are acrostics on the Hebrew alphabet. That is to say, the successive verses begin with the successive letters of the alphabet; the first with the letter corresponding to A, the second with B, and so on. And in the great third chapter each successive letter begins three successive verses. The fifth chapter has the same number of verses as it would have if it were an acrostic also; but for some unknown reason the acrostic form is dropped.

---

* Whenever the writer pauses to take breath, says Matthew Arnold.

† Dr. Driver takes no notice of this fact, when giving the reasons *pro* and *con*, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* I join in the gratitude with which this book has been received. It is an ornament to English theology. But a close examination of it in this case, and in some others where I happen to have some knowledge of my own, does not dispose me to place absolute confidence in it in other cases where I am not able to check it in this way. The air of moderation which it wears is more apparent than real.

* What can be the use of quoting as arguments against Jeremiah's authorship, as Dr. Driver does, single words occurring in Lamentations but not in Jeremiah, when, according to Dr. Driver's own theory, these words were current at the time and as accessible to Jeremiah as to any of his disciples? In a case like this, while striking resemblances of word or phrase are important evidence, minute verbal differences have no weight whatever.

Another argument to which Dr. Driver gives prominence, as proving that at least a portion of the book is not by Jeremiah, is that, while in the three poems after the first two of the initial Hebrew letters change places, they occupy in the first poem their usual positions. But he does not mention the simple suggestion of Ewald, that in the first poem an editorial hand may have altered the arrangement. The verses read better, Ewald thinks, when their initial letters stand as in chapters ii., iii., iv.

† The interpretation of those who do not accept Jeremiah's authorship of the book is that the nation personified speaks here. But in chapter i. the nation personified is a woman.

‡ Dr. Driver has a valuable note on the form of the biblical lament.

This strikes us as a very peculiar thing. It might be expected that a form so artificial must cramp the thought and crush out all naturalness. But it is not uncommon in Hebrew poetry. It appears in several of the Psalms, culminating in cxix., where, as is well known, each successive letter of the alphabet begins eight successive verses. It is essentially of the same nature as parallelism, alliteration, metre and rhyme. It appears to be the nature of poetical thought to submit itself to such restraints, and yet be able to move with more grace and freedom than in the slovenly garb of common speech. Odd as this acrostic form seems to us, it probably appeared far more natural to an ancient poet than rhyme would have done, which now is thought so natural. It was apparently resorted to when the material of the poem consisted of a great many somewhat similar remarks, and an artificial thread was needed on which to string the separate thoughts.*

The picture painted in the Lamentations is one of colossal sorrow. The siege and the sack of cities have always been horrible incidents of warfare; but the enemies by whom Jerusalem was destroyed were noted for their cruelty and ruthlessness. In their own annals and in their artistic delineations of their practices in war, which have been dug in recent times from beneath the sands of the desert, this is made painfully evident. The Babylonians, in the height of their power, not only practised the most outrageous cruelty, but gloried in it. And they had many reasons for not sparing Israel.

A most pitiful description is given by the author of the sufferings endured in the siege, especially from famine. The children swooned with hunger and cried for bread to their mothers, who had none to give. The aged gave up the ghost "while they sought their meat to relieve their souls." The famished crept through the streets like gray and feeble ghosts. Those who all their lives before had fed delicately and been clothed in scarlet were reduced to such extremities that they were willing to part with anything for a morsel of bread. Of the nobles* it is said that once "they were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies, their polishing was of sapphire": but now, as the effect of famine, "their visage is blacker than a coal; they are not known in the streets" (so disfigured are they); "their skin cleaveth to their bones; it is withered, it is become like a stick." The dark rumour was even in circulation that mothers, mad with hunger, had sodden their own children.

After the siege came the indescribable horrors of the sack of the city, when the gates were burst open and the brutal soldiery, irritated by long delay, rushed in to wreak their will on the doomed inhabitants. Every home had to endure its own share of cruelty and shame. But above all private grief towered the public calamity. Everything noble and venerable, to which patriotic affection and religious feeling clung, was ruthlessly dishonoured. To crown all, in the temple was heard the ribald noise and shouting of the enemy, loud as had been in happier days the mirth of the solemn festivals. "The adversary hath spread out his hand upon all her pleasant things; for she hath seen that the heathen entered her sanctuary, whom Thou didst command that they should not enter into Thy congregation."

Then followed the deportation of the inhabitants to Babylon, in which king and princes, priests and prophets, high and low, were all mingled in a common degradation; and, as the long procession moved away, they could see, or seemed in their melancholy hearts to see, the ancient and implacable enemies of Israel, such as the Edomites, drawn up along the path as scornful and exultant spectators of their calamity.

A remnant were left behind, among whom was the author of Lamentations. But their lot was perhaps the most pitiable of all. Not only were they constantly harassed by the incursions of the skirmishers from the desert and made to live in perpetual fear, but they had before their eyes the ruins of their country and their capital. The gates were sunk in the ground and the bars broken; the city was a heap of ruins, and silence reigned in the streets. "A sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things"; and, as amidst the silence of the deserted city they remembered the days of music and mirth, calling to mind especially the happy pilgrim bands which used to make vocal the roads of the country, now deserted, and to crowd the courts of the temple, now in ruins, no wonder they cried, "How is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed!"

---

* Dr. Driver alleges this acrostic form as an argument against attributing the book to Jeremiah, "who in his literary style followed the promptings of nature"!

* In Authorized Version, "Nazarites."

To all this history of sorrow the author of Lamentations gives the most complete and sympathetic expression. The book is full of tears. "Mine eye runneth down with rivers of water," he says, "for the destruction of the daughter of my people." In the first chapter he personifies Israel as a woman weeping and appealing to the whole world: "Is it nothing to you all ye that pass by? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow."

But he had a deeper purpose than merely to give vent to the national grief. All through these poems the minds of the people for whose use they were composed are directed, in a truly prophetic spirit, to the cause of their sufferings. The Babylonians were not the cause: they were merely the instruments of a higher will. It was God who was chastising them; and they were chastised because they had sinned: "The Lord hath afflicted her for the multitude of her transgressions." "The Lord is righteous; for I have rebelled against His commandment." Such is the undertone from first to last below the record of calamity; and the poet seeks to impress on his fellow sufferers that hope lies only in acknowledging their iniquity and seeking forgiveness from Him against whom they have sinned.

The most remarkable of all the five chapters is the middle one. The other two on each side may be said to lean up against it, while it towers above them. In it Jeremiah comes forward to speak in his own person, beginning with the words already quoted, "I am the man that hath seen affliction." He goes on to give a poetical description of his own history, for the purpose of showing the right way of dealing with trouble.

His fellow-sufferers had just come into trouble, but he had been a man of sorrows all his life. Years before their chastisement arrived, the hand of God had been laid heavily on him: "He bent his bow, and set me as a mark for the arrow. He caused the arrows of His quiver to enter into my reins. I was a derision to all my people, and their song all the day." His personal grief might have been described in the very words which would now describe their public calamity. But he had discovered for himself the way out of trouble, and he could now teach it to them.

At first he had agitated himself and cried out against the hand which was chastising him; his whole being was in tumult and refused to be comforted. But, when he became still and humbled himself, then the day broke and the day-star arose in his heart. The most delightful and comforting truths came pouring into his mind; in the strength of which he surmounted sorrow; and, though outward trouble did not cease, he was able to rise above it.

It is here that there come in a dozen or score of verses totally different from the rest of this book. The rest of the book is steeped in tears; this portion is flushed with sunshine: "It is of the Lord's mercies we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not. They are new every morning; great is Thy faithfulness. The Lord is my portion, saith my soul; therefore will I hope in Him. The Lord is good unto them that wait for Him, unto the soul that seeketh Him. It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of God. It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth. . . . For the Lord will not cast off for ever; but, though He cause grief, yet will He have compassion according to the multitude of His mercies. For He doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men."

These verses are like a bed of water-lilies lying on the surface of a brackish and desolate mere. The rest of the book may be compared to a sky full of black and dripping clouds, but these verses are like a rainbow arched athwart them. They speak of hope in the depths of desolation, and show the way to reach it. They sound the true evangelic note, which echoes all through the Scripture. They lead up to the proposal with which, at the close of them, Jeremiah appeals to his fellow countrymen, "Let us search and try our way, and turn again to the Lord."

Thus the book has not merely a historical and poetical interest; but it handles with inspired power the problems of sin and suffering, and points out clearly the way to God.

As we close it, the image which remains in our minds is that figure of the Septuagint—Jeremiah seated on the ruins of Jerusalem, with the calamity of his country in all its compass and significance mirrored in his tear-filled heart. And that figure makes our eye travel forward to another. Another son of Israel and lover of Jerusalem, when He was come near, as He descended the Mount of Olives, beheld the city, and wept over it. Strange city! What sons that nation bore! How amazingly they loved her! And how unmotherly was her treatment of them!

Some said, in the days of our Lord's flesh, that He was Jeremiah; and between the prophet and the Saviour there were many resemblances. Both loved the people and the capital of their country with passionate affection. Both were repaid with deadly cruelty and persecution, and yet they could not cease to love. Each of them was the man of sorrows of his own age. But from the book of Lamentations we may draw a profounder resemblance. Jeremiah in this book attempted to solve the twin mysteries of suffering and sin; and may we not say that to do this was the purpose of the whole life of Christ? Jeremiah solved the mystery well; but it was left for Jesus to give the perfect solution, when He made sin the background on which to display to the universe the glory of love Divine, and when, by His suffering even unto death, He brought to the world joy unspeakable and life eternal.

MRS. BESANT'S DOUBT AND HER INTERVIEW WITH DR. PUSEY.

BY REV. PRINCIPAL CHARLES CHAPMAN, LL.D.

From *The Thinker* (London), January, 1892.

ONE of the most touching and suggestive pieces of personal history published in modern times, in so far as it relates to religious experience, is the account given in a recent number of the *Review of Reviews* of the progress, or perhaps more correctly, the decline of Mrs. Besant from the Christian faith to blank Atheism, followed by a slight return upwards to Theosophy. Its value is enhanced by the fact that it is chiefly autobiographical. Mrs. Besant's association with the late Mr. Bradlaugh in the advocacy of certain social doctrines, her enthusiasm for the Secularist movement, and the not too complimentary allusions in the press to her former domestic relations had conspired to produce an impression on the public mind unfavourable to her. To many, therefore, the article referred to came as a welcome relief, giving as it did information concerning her early domestic troubles, the origin and progress of her mental conflicts, and the upright, blameless moral character manifested throughout her trials. Mrs. Besant may take to herself the consolation that by means of these revelations there has been awakened, in the minds of many who cling to the Christian faith as for very life, a sincere sympathy and respect; and she may rest assured that there are not a few who would count it a privilege, if permitted, to do what in them lay to assist her towards attaining to that sweet rest and quiet confidence in Christ which is the most precious treasure they on earth can call their own. Though they may not have been through all the phases of experience that have formed the web and woof of her chequered history, they have, in some instances at least, known the "horror of great darkness," and stood on the brink of most awful precipices, looking with sad heart on the deep and gloomy abyss that lay sheer before them. In the future, she need not lack sympathy and most kindly help should she ever care to seek it.

Many are the religious and philosophical questions raised by the narrative of the experiences of this troubled soul; but on the present occasion I shall confine my attention exclusively to her interview with Dr. Pusey. It is nothing new in the history of the Christian Church for perplexed inquirers to seek counsel of pastors and others whose education and peculiar experience offered some guarantee for readiness and ability to guide the seeker after truth into the right way. Every day there are cases of this kind, and not a few are being constantly led to exchange their restlessness and uncertainty for assured peace and rational conviction. But it is rare that the public is made acquainted, on the one hand, with the sorrows and perplexities of such a notable character, and, on the other, with the procedure, in dealing with them, of so distinguished a counsellor; and the interest aroused in this case becomes the more pathetic from the fact that the interview proved to be the turning point in the career of the sufferer downwards towards the blankest Atheism.

Considering that, according to her own representation, Mrs. Besant was sincerely and eagerly in search of the truth concerning Christ, and that she regarded her revered and learned adviser to be of all men the most likely to help her in the quest, it may well be asked, Was her difficulty beyond solution in the Christian sense? Or was the counsellor in absolute error with respect to the advice given? Or, if not in absolute error, was there failure to read the real secret of the trouble, and a consequent misapplication of a remedy otherwise good and adequate? Or were there personal elements in this case which, for the time being, rendered the wisest counsels and the most cogent arguments nugatory?

In order to form an approximately correct judgment on the value of the advice tendered, and the general attitude of Dr. Pusey towards his spiritual patient as he regarded her, it will be well to take note of Mrs. Besant's theological position just prior to and at the time that she sought the interview. If we keep to the exact words of the writer of the article in the *Review of Reviews*, her position is not set before us as clearly as it might have been. There is evidently some confusion of thought in the following :—

"ALL CHRISTIAN DOGMAS GO BUT ONE."

"These duties of the parish, however, could not silence the ceaseless strife within. Her health broke down, and she went to London to recover. When there, she found in Mr. Voysey's ministrations 'a gleam of light across the stormy sea of doubt and distress,' but Theism afforded her only a temporary resting-place. She now definitely rejected what she called all the 'barbarous doctrines of the Christian faith,' and felt with relief and joy that 'they were but the dreams of ignorant and semi-savage minds, not the revelation of a God.' One last dogma, however, still remained. Not all her reading of Theodore Parker and Francis Newman and Miss Cobbe had been able to rob her of her faith in the Deity of Christ. She clung to it all the more closely because it was the last and to her the dearest of all."

If in the above paragraph it is intended to state that she first accepted such Theism as Mr. Voysey taught, but afterwards rejected it for Christianity, though with some doubt as to the personality of Christ, it is intelligible and is no discredit to Mrs. Besant's logical acuteness. But if the meaning be that, while finding "a temporary resting-place," *i.e.*, before her final descent to Atheism, in Mr. Voysey's Theism, she *cast aside* "barbarous doctrines of the Christian faith," and *remained in doubt*—only concerning the Deity of Christ, then her theological position was most singular, and such as no person claiming one-half her intellectual ability would think of assuming. The idea of a Theist of the Voysey stamp still clinging to the chief doctrine of the Christian faith—the Deity of Christ—is certainly a new thing in the world! Mr. Voysey is in no doubt about the Person of Christ. His rank Theism leaves no room for uncertainty on that point.

But if we turn from the words of the writer of the article to those of Mrs. Besant herself, it would appear that at the date of her entering upon the special investigation into the question of the actual position of Christ, she was so far a Christian as to accept the Gospel narratives as being on the whole historic, and her desire was to learn from the representations therein contained in what light she ought to regard Him. She was more than a Theist, though in doubt as to what sort of Christian she could be—whether an orthodox believer in the true Divinity of Christ, or simply a Unitarian. The question with her was how to formulate her faith concerning the Founder of the Christian religion. We are accordingly told that "before she finally parted with all her Christian faith, she took a step which in itself is sufficient to render her autobiography invaluable to the historian and theologian." The step alluded to is the visit paid to Dr. Pusey in order to state her difficulties concerning the Person of Christ, and ask his help in solving them conformably to the orthodox view.

Mrs. Besant seems to have been influenced by powerful reasons in thus seeking the guidance and help of Dr. Pusey. She was under the constraint of an intense longing to find intellectual rest. Her life had been one of weary conflict with distressing doubts concerning most momentous subjects ; and she felt it was now high time that some clear and restful views were attained respecting Him whose name and influence were indelibly impressed on Christendom. Then, she had been a member of the Church of England, the wife of a clergyman, and so far as party feeling and preference had had sway, she was, in name and by customary worship, attached to the High Church section. It was thus only natural that, in seeking aid, she should turn her thoughts towards the section of the Church of England with which she was in sympathy ; and as Dr. Pusey was in her judgment its most distinguished representative, and had, by his writings, taught her for many years, and "in former days" wielded over her "a great influence," it was most proper that she should endeavour to secure the benefit of his sympathy and advice at this critical juncture. Her confidence in his character and ability was such as to induce the conviction that if there was any man in the world who could, by the reasons he adduced, lead her to a full and unreserved acceptance of the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, that man was Dr. Pusey. Referring to her difficulties she says, "If he resolved them for me, I should escape the trouble I foresaw ; if he could not resolve them, then, *no answer to them was to be hoped for.*" Thus she staked her entire future on the ability of one man. It was a desperate venture. How much of reason and how much of wild passion there was in it must be left to the calm judgment of men.

The narrative given of Dr. Pusey's bearing and conduct is in Mrs. Besant's own words. After referring to certain correspondence with him in which it appears he had recommended a course of reading and finally agreed to an interview, she says, “He treated me as a penitent going to confession, seeking the advice of a director, not as an inquirer struggling after truth, and resolved to find some firm standing ground in the sea of doubt, whether on the shores of orthodoxy or of heresy. He would not deal with the question of the Deity of Christ as a question of argument: he reminded me, ‘You are speaking of your judge’ when I pressed some question . . . . and asked him if he could recommend me any books that would throw light upon the subject: ‘No, no, you have read too much already. You must pray, you must pray.’ Then, as I said I could not believe without proof, I was told, ‘Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed’; and my further questioning him was checked by the murmur, ‘O my child, how undisciplined! how impatient!’” The rest of the narrative I give entire on account of its graphic form and touching character.

“‘AT YOUR PERIL YOU REJECT IT!’

“‘It is not your duty to ascertain the truth,’ he told me sternly. ‘It is your duty to accept and believe the truth as laid down *by the Church;* at your peril you reject it; the responsibility is not yours so long as you dutifully accept what the Church has laid down for your acceptance. Did not the Lord promise that the presence of the Spirit should be ever with His Church, to guide her into all truth?’

“‘But the fact of the promise and its value are the very points on which I am doubtful,’ I answered.

“He shuddered. ‘Pray, pray,’ he said; ‘Father, forgive her, for she knows not what she says.’

“It was in vain I urged I had everything to gain and nothing to lose by following his directions, but that it seemed to me that fidelity to truth forbade a pretended acceptance of that which was not believed.

“Everything to lose? Yes, indeed. You will be lost for time and lost for eternity.’

“‘Lost or not,’ I rejoined, ‘I must and will find out what is true, and I will not believe until *I am sure.*’

“‘You have no right to make terms with God,’ he answered, ‘as to what you will believe and what you will not believe. You are full of intellectual pride.’

“‘I FORBID YOU TO SPEAK OF YOUR DISBELIEF.’

“I sighed hopelessly. Little feeling of pride was there in me just then, and I felt that in this rigid unyielding dogmatism there was no comprehension of my difficulties, no help for my strugglings. I rose, and, thanking him for his courtesy, said that I would not waste his time further, that I must go home and just face the difficulties out, openly leaving the Church and taking the consequences. Then for the first time his serenity was ruffled.

“‘I forbid you to speak of your disbelief,’ he cried; ‘I forbid you to lead into your own lost state the souls for whom Christ died.’

“Slowly and sadly I took my way back to the railway station, knowing that my last chance of escape had failed me.”

There can be no doubt but that Christian men of all denominations and shades of belief have already passed silent judgment on the whole case as presented by Mrs. Besant herself. The question has been asked and in the privacy of individual minds has been answered, Was Dr. Pusey right or wrong in his treatment of Mrs. Besant? How far is her subsequent departure from all faith to be ascribed to herself, or how far to the particular conduct and bearing at this critical juncture of Dr. Pusey? Now, it seems to me that there are two considerations that should moderate our judgment: one, that it must not be assumed for certain that a treatment of a difficult case like this, however wise and just, would issue in bringing the doubter over to the true faith; the other, that our judgments on Dr. Pusey's method will be affected by the views entertained by the kind and amount of argument requisite in ordinary cases for warranting a rational conviction of the truth of the Deity of Christ, and also by our accord or want of accord with his idea of Church authority in matters of doctrine. Neither Scripture nor reason throw the sole responsibility of failure to win souls to faith on the individual who seeks to win them. Not even Christ when among men persuaded some unbelievers to believe on Himself. There is a guilt of unwillingness to see amidst profession of desire for truth. Those who object to Dr. Pusey's High Church claim for authority, apart from all argument, may imagine that he would have succeeded had he employed the reasoning usually recognized as adequate by theologians. But this is a *non sequitur.* We must not do him that injustice. He may have adduced all the best arguments which the learning and skill of ages have furnished, and yet all may have been lost on Mrs. Besant. In religion, and even in historical matters, the personal element counts for much. Reasoning overwhelmingly powerful to one is insufficient for another; not because there is essential invalidity in it, but because there is something unconsciously operative in the individual to whom it is presented, that hinders it from exercising its proper constraint over the intellect. There is much more in a human being than mere intellect. The intellect moves only in relation to the rest of our nature. Religious truths, unlike mathematical, are intimately connected with the deepest experience of the spirit, and receive a colouring and draw a setting from the unexpressed and inexpressible *Self*. Formal conclusions arrived at may not embody all that is latent unconsciously in the inner man.

But to return to Dr. Pusey's method, I am disposed to think that his attitude towards Mrs. Besant at the very beginning of the interview was inconsistent with his previous action, and therefore at once produced a damaging effect on her mind. In the preliminary correspondence, when she expressed her doubts and sought help, he advised her to read Liddon's argument as worked out in the well-known Bampton Lectures : at the very beginning of the personal interview he treated her as though she were a penitent, and required of her instant and unquestioned submission to the decisions of an infallible Church. Those of us who read the narrative see at a glance the logical inconsistency of the two courses ; and Mrs. Besant was too keen a logician not to be astonished and intellectually injured by this change of attitude. The *letter* had practically said, " See how completely the reasoning of Liddon proves the point ; find in his arguments rest for your intellect." The living *voice* practically said, " The point is once for all settled for you by an infallible authority ; and all you have to do is to bow submissively to that authority : believe and don't think." Mrs. Besant had been led to expect guidance into truth : she met with a blunt demand for blind submission. I am not referring now to the correctness nor incorrectness of Dr. Pusey's personal faith in the Church as the infallible authority in matters to be believed. I am speaking solely of the natural effect of the inconsistency of his entire procedure on the mind of his interviewer, as giving us one clue to his failure in winning her over to the faith. No doubt Dr. Pusey was his true self in the demand made at the interview. For, strictly speaking, it is a superfluity for those who hold to the high doctrine of Church infallibility and priestly authority to trouble themselves with reasonings to prove this or that Christian dogma. That has been all settled for them, and once for all, by an authority from which there is no appeal, and to criticize or attempt to qualify or amend the decisions once arrived at by that authority is an act of impiety. To set forth even the reasons that led to the dogmas and so justify the claim on submission, is virtually to appeal to the reason of men, and to dispense with the doctrine of supreme and unalterable authority. Dr. Liddon's work, in so far as it proves to the ordinary judgment of men the truth of the divinity of Christ, is a disclaimer of the demand to submit to dogma on the ground that the Church has once for all without error settled the matter. The only consistent course is to prove, if possible, the right or power of the Church to decide what is the doctrine and the form in which it is to be expressed, and then to demand of every one entire and instant submission. To prove the doctrine after that is quite useless. Romanism is logical : High Anglicanism when dealing with doctrine is too often illogical.

Further, deeper down than this inconsistency in the general treatment of the case lay a very serious defect : Dr. Pusey failed to establish sympathy. In most cases of personal intercourse, it is half the victory if sympathy be established between the seeker and the renderer of help. The opportunities of doing this were at Dr. Pusey's side. Prior to the interview, there was much on Mrs. Besant's part to render her very susceptible to any effort he might make to enter into her real feelings and win her confidence. She had earnestly desired to see him. She had a profound respect for his life's work and great reverence for his character. She was prepared to open her mind to him without reserve, having full faith in his ability and goodness. Not often does a guide of the perplexed find one so prepared for sympathetic treatment. It may be thought that Dr. Pusey was quite right in thinking, when face to face with her, that she had already read too much, and that, therefore, something other than new and additional arguments was required. There are persons whose need is rather spiritual than intellectual. He had, probably, a shrewd suspicion of the existence of a restless temperament which interfered with the acquisition of truth ; and it was only right that this circumstance should influence his judgment in the procedure adopted. But it was the discovery of this which rendered it more than ever important to proceed with care in the establishment of full sympathy. She should somehow be made to feel that here was one who saw through all her mental perplexities, assessed their value on the intellectual side, and knew something of the yearning which accompanied them. Whether it arose from sheer incapacity to enter into the real sorrows of one tossed on the sea of doubt, or from the habit of acting the priestly part of father confessor to those who came to him, or from both these causes, the result was that all the springs of sympathy were stopped by his rather abrupt and authoritative closure of all the avenues to truth along which she had hoped to be led. This was, as I have pointed out, not only inconsistent with his correspondence with her, but it at once created a revulsion in the mind of his auditor, shook her confidence in him as one who could help her, and raised a barrier between the two souls which nothing could pass. He saw her intellectual restlessness as a fact in her life, but said nothing and did nothing to cause her to feel that he had placed himself in her position and entered sympathetically into her troubles. With the quick instinct of an educated woman she saw that he did not realize her difficulties and bear them on his heart, and hence she felt that he could never offer the clue to their solution. The two beings lived in different intellectual hemispheres, and spoke an untranslatable language. It was Dr. Pusey's business to cross over in imagination to her hemisphere, and learn the language of her soul. This he did not do.

Again, Dr. Pusey added to the original difficulty by the introduction of another. His visitor wanted instruction and guidance in reference to a particular Christian doctrine: she wished to know the evidence for accepting the Deity of Christ as the revealed truth of God, and she supposed that in consequence of his great learning he would be able to point out what she had overlooked, or would marshal the facts in such a way as to bring her the light for which she was craving. Thus her distinct inquiry was met by a withholding of what was sought; and, on the other hand, by a demand that she should accept another and totally different doctrine, namely, that of the infallible authority of the Church on questions of religious truth, and that too as a substitute for the exercise of one's own judgment on the evidence available for proof. Thus Mrs. Besant was intent on knowing about one doctrine; Dr. Pusey insisted on the immediate acceptance of two doctrines. She wanted Scriptural reasons for believing on Christ as the true Son of God; he not only gave no such reasons, but required that she should believe something else at the expense of her own free judgment. It is obvious that Mrs. Besant's Churchism was not of Dr. Pusey's type; for she was utterly surprised at the unreasonableness of this procedure. Naturally, instead of easing the original difficulty, it aggravated it. It immediately aroused antagonism, and tended to bring the vanishing confidence in her adviser down to zero. It meant for her the surrender of all inquiry, all thought on the matter of the Person of Christ, all respect for one's own faculties, all sense of personal responsibility in matters of faith.

The doctrine of the Church as the infallible seat of authority in matters pertaining to religion opens up a great question on which I cannot enter here and now. I am concerned only with the use made of it in seeking to bring Mrs. Besant to accept the doctrine of the true Divinity of Christ. Dr. Pusey should have remembered that this doctrine of an infallible authority, overriding all the thinking and judgments of individuals, sincere or earnest Christians though they may be, is not itself an Article of Faith in the sense that the Deity of Christ is. It is a preliminary question to that of what is revealed concerning Christ. It cannot be established by assuming that the Church has right and power *ex cathedra* to settle it without appeal; for that is to beg the very question. It is to say, the infallible Church establishes the doctrine of its infallibility—a piece of logical nonsense. Reasons appealing to the judgment of men alone can serve in such a case; and thus, even though it be shown that the Church is as infallible as is claimed in settling dogmas, they and its infallibility are ultimately made to rest on an appeal to the reason as instructed by Scripture. It was too much to suppose that Mrs. Besant, even as Dr. Pusey knew her, would at once bow down to this great assumption of infallible authority, and crush out her spirit of inquiry. One reason why she should do so Dr. Pusey did offer, namely, the fact that the promise of the Holy Spirit to lead into all truth was given by Christ; only with the characteristic tendency of the school to which he belonged, he assumed that these words, addressed to the Apostles in the course of their being equipped for their special work, applied in equal sense and measure to those who were not Apostles, and had reference to the verbal formulation of all subsequent revelations to them; thus, overlooking the real fulfilment when the Apostles were afterwards specially inspired to call to mind what Christ had taught them *viva voce*, as well as to interpret for the entire world the significance of Christ's life and death and resurrection; while, on the other hand, no instance is recorded of their combining with the entire body of Christians, *i.e.*, with the Church, to formulate dogmas out of the current teaching, and to which they demanded unquestioning submission. The instance of

Acts xv. 28, 29 is not to the point, since the matters referred to are not doctrinal but practical. The Apostle Paul was very careful to assign reasons for his positive teaching (1 Cor. xv. 1–8), and exhorted Christians to prove all things and hold fast that which was good ; thus also explaining why the Bereans who "searched the Scriptures" to see whether "those things were so, were more noble."

Possibly, Dr. Pusey assumed that as a Churchwoman coming to a Churchman of very pronounced principles, Mrs. Besant ought to have been aware of his doctrine of Church Authority in matters of faith. Perhaps she was inconsequential in her action. Logically, an inquirer ought not to look for a reasoning process to establish the doctrine of the Person of Christ from one who believes that the Church has settled it, and that all duty is now comprised in submission. At all events, it argued a lack of practical sagacity on his part that, when he knew that she in practice was not recognizing such authority and was deliberately asking for proofs, he gave her only another stupendous doctrine to be accepted without full and free discussion.

Passing on to a more general consideration of the difficulties of Mrs. Besant, it seems to me that with such a character, with one circumstanced as she had been, one of the first and most important things to be done would be to establish friendly relations without too great eagerness at first to enter into a hard and continuous discussion of the question at issue. It had been well to approach the subject gradually, not through the intellect or by requiring a formal submission of the will, but by the quiet and tender influences on a susceptible nature, of an unaffected Christian kindliness of spirit manifested in varied forms of interest in the past life, present circumstances, and future hopes of the visitor. Strong citadels may be taken by a slow and subtle process, though they are proof against a direct assault. Dr. Pusey was not destitute of tenderness, but it was indicated in passing words of regret, rather than in a line of conduct that would circumvent the life. He saw the need of spiritual influence to the ascertainment of truth ; but all the use he made of this knowledge was to exhort her to pray. If, instead of telling her that she was intellectually proud and had need to pray, he had, avoiding every expression of reproach or fault-finding, taken her by the hand and knelt down there and then, and out of the fulness and pity of a deeply sympathetic heart poured out to God his desires on her behalf, in loving words born of the occasion, he would probably have done more to tone down her restlessness and prepare the way for a future interview for quiet and helpful conversation, than could be accomplished by the most elaborate reasoning, and certainly by any demand for submission.

It may be asked what sort of evidence of the Divinity of Christ is likely to avail with one like Mrs. Besant, provided one has gained her confidence and brought spiritual influence to bear ? The evidence is very varied—embodied in definite Scriptural terms and allusions, involved in the attitude assumed by Him when on earth, in the entire scope of His work and in His relation to both prophets and apostles ; and drawn also from the facts of Christian experience and the triumphs of Christianity. But it does not follow that the line of proof that would suffice with one individual would serve for another. The effect of light depends much on the medium through which it has to penetrate. There are some whose faith rests on a deep personal experience, and to whom the explicit and implicit language of Scripture concerning Him is but supplementary, while in others the reverse order holds good. Supposing one had to furnish Mrs. Besant at that time with considerations that would probably weigh with her, the first step would have been to ascertain where she stood with respect to God, to Scripture, to Apostolic authority, and then to work from the basis so found. It appears that her Theism just then was clear and strong. But as Theism is of various shades, it would be necessary to ascertain what was involved in it. If it meant that God was not only Personal, but took a personal interest in His rational creatures on the earth, felt towards them as Father, and in some definite form revealed His will to His children, and was ever ready to hear and answer their prayer for spiritual help ; if, further, it meant that He had given a supernatural revelation through prophets and Jesus of Nazareth, and that the latter had transmitted teaching authority to His Apostles, then there would be solid ground for ascertaining what portions of our New Testament were held to contain revelations concerning the person and position of Jesus of Nazareth. Mrs. Besant seems to have had doubts about the Fourth Gospel being Apostolic ; but admitting the Synoptics and the four unchallenged Epistles, it certainly would be possible to construct an argument out of these which to an unprejudiced mind would be satisfactory. I say "unprejudiced" mind, because it is notorious that because of an unwillingness to admit the Divinity of Christ as an Apostolic doctrine, the rationalistic school endeavour to rule out of the argument the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. The feeling of the Tübingen school is well-indicated by Dr. Carpenter's quotation from a paper read in America by a Unitarian, Dr. George Ellis, to the effect that from the side of Scriptural authority "the orthodox had the best of it; and that the way now to deal with the question at issue is to throw over this authority altogether."* One would have had to ascertain from Mrs. Besant, at the time, whether she entertained this predisposition not to accept the doctrine if possible. In that case, the question would become one, not of argument, but of Christian therapeutics; and some spiritual influence gradually working into the heart and life would be the chief *desideratum*. That this kind of influence as a preparation was most necessary is manifest from the account given of her previous religious experience and her manner when visiting Dr. Pusey.

The key to the solution of her difficulties lay in a right apprehension of her religious history, and the bent of her mental tendencies. From the time that she began to doubt and question there were signs of sheer restlessness. The intellectual fever sometimes ran high. The attitude she assumed towards the order of Providence when she lost her child revealed a real passion against the Almighty, and although this passion subsided, the mental temper it revealed ran throughout her life. Her present heat and zeal in the speculations of Theosophy are the outcome of the same thing. She lacked, and lacks still, the calm, equable spirit which alone can ensure the clear apprehension of truth. Time may do much to tone down the fires of eager, restless speculation, and then when the nature regains its balance and the spiritual side attains its proper development, it may be that she will find, as many others equal to her in ability and in honesty have done, the truth that all along has been close at hand. Then she will be surprised that ever she made the reality of a great truth to depend on the ability of one man to lead a feverish intellect to it, and that immediate demonstration was sought for truths which require for their apprehension both a good intellect and a gentle, loving, child spirit that finds in God a real Father.

THE SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN-THE-EVANGELIST AND THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

From *The Guardian* (Ch. Eng.), London, December 9, 1891.

It is not our practice, nor is it our wish, to criticise the management of a private society, however well known it may be or however important to the Church. We should have, therefore, preferred to omit all reference to the incident which is troubling at once the American Church and the Society of St. John-the-Evangelist, Cowley. But it has been so widely noticed in America, and has, in consequence, become the subject of so much comment in England, that it is useless to affect to ignore it—especially as there are some aspects of the matter which do not seem to be apprehended either in America or in this country. The facts of the case are simple enough. As every one knows, the Cowley Society has for many years had a branch in America, in connection with which many of the most eminent members of the society, both American and English, have worked. Of these none has been better known in America than Father Hall, whose work for the last eighteen years in Boston has made him one of the most prominent men not only in that city and in the diocese of Massachusetts, but in the whole American Church. Originally an Englishman, Father Hall has become a naturalised American citizen, and by his fellow-Churchmen, if not by himself, his position was regarded as so permanent that he was appointed to such diocesan posts as membership of the Standing Committee and of the General Convention. It has therefore been a great surprise and shock to the parish in which he has laboured, and to the diocese and Church of which he has been an important member, to hear that he has been recalled to England by the Superior of the society to which he owes obedience. Eager protests have been made by public meetings in Boston, and some of the American Bishops have joined in them. The ground of Father Page's action is, as we understand it, twofold. In the first place, in a question which has profoundly agitated the American Church Father Hall took a part opposed to the views of the society which he represented in America. The election of Dr. Phillips Brooks as Bishop of Massachusetts, obviously fitted for such a post as he is by his ability and great personal influence, is yet regarded by many American Churchmen as a grave danger to the cause of Catholic truth. Not only is Dr. Brooks what is generally called an extreme Broad Churchman, but some years ago he invited the Unitarian ministers to communicate in his church, and publicly administered the Communion to them. This action has not been denied, nor has Dr. Phillips Brooks withdrawn from the position which he thus assumed. His election under these circumstances has naturally been regarded in America as a very significant step, and it may lead to very serious consequences. The Diocesan Convention formally certified to Dr. Brooks's orthodoxy, and the American Bishops, some of whom undoubtedly made that certificate the ground of their action, confirmed the election. It is thus clear that the certificate was of considerable importance, and the *gravamen* against Father Hall is that, as a member of the Diocesan Convention, he signed the certificate. The Superior, considering this step as contrary to the views of the members of the society both in England and in America, held that it made it impossible for Father Hall to retain his post as Provincial. His was no ordinary influence on the Convention. Such is the position that he holds in the American Church that his signature seems to have had great weight with some at least of the Bishops who voted for confirming the election. The Superior claimed no right to control Father Hall's action in the matter, but he does claim the right to consider it in deciding the question whether he should continue at the head of the American branch of the society.

---

* *Nature and Man*, p. 130.

Another matter has also to be considered. We understand that there is a grave difference of opinion between Father Hall and the rest of the society as to the relations between the society and the American "Province." It is clear that the relation of strict dependence cannot be permanent, and the majority of the society wish to grant a position of "free affiliation" to the American Province, a wish that is shared by most of the Fathers working in the United States. But it is not shared by Father Hall. He holds that complete independence is the only practical policy, and though he is willing to accept the policy of affiliation, it is without any hope of its succeeding. As the affiliation scheme has to be tried it seems clear that, to give it a fair chance, it must be tried under a Provincial who is favourable to it, not under one who is not. For these reasons Father Page has recalled Father Hall.

It is plain that outsiders cannot judge of the force of the considerations which induced him to take so serious a step. The society, and the society alone, can know enough of its own inner working to estimate the arguments, on both sides obviously weighty, for and against such a proceeding. But even supposing the American supporters of Father Hall are right, and that the Superior has acted unwisely in recalling so tried and eminent a worker from his sphere of successful labour, it seems to us that they have mistaken the point at issue. They have forgotten that Father Hall is a member of a society to whose rules he has promised obedience, and that the Superior is acting strictly in accordance with those rules in recalling him. They look upon Father Hall, not as one of the Society of St. John the-Evangelist, but as the parish priest of an American congregation. A religious society may be an anachronism and a mistake, but if it exists it must have a rule, and the duty of its members is to obey the rule. We gather, however, that the American complainants are not of those who object to religious societies in general. They approve of the principle, but they object to its application in this particular instance. It seems to us, on the other hand, that if religious societies have any *raison d'être* at all, if they are to effect anything which cannot be done by the ordinary methods of Church organisation, it is by virtue of the rule of obedience that they will do it. The Church is fully competent to organise Missions and to establish successful parochial institutions without any religious orders or vows or rules; but to possess a body of men pledged to observe a certain rule and to carry out a certain work in the spirit of obedience is another matter altogether. We have every reason to believe that Father Hall's work in America has been of the highest usefulness, and that he has greatly strengthened Church principles in that country; but we are convinced that the development of community life in the Church of England is of such vast importance that no personal work or influence can be weighed against it for a moment. The whole controversy seems to show that the position of a religious society is not rightly understood by many loyal Churchmen, and it is very important that they should be brought to realise it. Subject to the paramount canonical claims of the Church, every member of the Society of St. John-the-Evangelist is bound to obey the Superior in accordance with the rule of the society. It was by virtue of this obedience that Father Hall originally went to America; it is by virtue of the same obedience that he now returns to England. The

American Church has profited by the rule of the society, and ought not to complain that she now suffers under the same rule. The society could not exist if it had not the right to decide where its members shall work. Otherwise whenever a man of force and influence is sent to a distant country, he will practically be lost to the society, which will thus become a mere training college for missionaries. Father Page's action may have been wise or unwise—that is a question on which we have neither the right nor the wish to pronounce; but, whether it be one or the other, those who understand the essential principles of religious societies, and appreciate their value to the Church of England, will, we are sure, refuse to criticise it on grounds which, however applicable to parochial or even missionary organisations, are wholly inapplicable to a society the first principle of which is obedience to an elected Head.

THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

BY THE REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenom.), New York, January 2 and 9, 1892.

No apology is needed for inviting attention to the question, What is the Seat of Authority in Religion? In America it is the burning question of the hour, and in our own country the faith of many is disturbed and their religious sentiment shocked through the lack of well-ascertained conclusions regarding it.

At the Reformation there was no question regarding the *source* of authority in religion. All alike believed then, as all alike believe now, that the voice of God is authoritative. The question between the parties was, How are we to know what is God's word, and where is that word to be found? On these questions they had opinions diametrically opposed. The Church of Rome claimed two functions, both of which were disallowed by the Protestants. It claimed to be the permanent incarnation of Christ, the body of the Lord, the organ of his Spirit, equally with Scripture able to guide to God; and it claimed to be alone able to determine what is Scripture. Luther's claim was that the individual can deal directly with God apart from the mediation of the Church, and that God's word verified itself in the conscience of the individual, apart from the authority of the Church.

"The Church," said Luther, "cannot give more force or authority to a book than it has in itself. A Council cannot make that to be Scripture which in its own nature is not Scripture." With that one word Luther established Protestantism, and set all generations free from the bondage of the Church. But Luther accomplished more. Protestantism is not merely the substitution of one external guide for another: it is rather the exchange of what is outward for what is inward; of what is indirect for what is direct. It is the exchange of God's voice recognized by the Church and interpreted by the Church for God's voice recognized by the individual and interpreted by the individual. The Reformation was no doubt a transference of allegiance from the Church to the Scriptures, but that was by no means all it accomplished; it was also a transition from dependence on the Church's authority to dependence on conscience. It was essentially the assertion of the indefeasible right and duty of the individual to deal with God directly and for himself. And he is only half a Protestant who merely transfers his allegiance from the Church to the Bible, and leans upon this new crutch as the Romanist leans on Rome. The Spirit of Christ is in the Church as truly as in the Bible, but who is for me to sift the human from the divine and give me perfect assurance that here God himself speaks to me? None but myself only. It is only the response of conscience which can so guide and determine me. To accept the Bible on the Church's authority, and to accept every statement in it as infallible truth whether it awakes response in conscience or not, is to remain precisely in the Romanist's position. It is to yield the guidance of our own spiritual affairs to something external to conscience, and thereby to separate ourselves from God.

That this was Luther's position there can be no doubt. "Thou must be as certain that it is the word of God as thou art certain that thou livest, and even more certain, for on this alone must thy conscience rest. And even if all men came—aye, even the angels and all the world—and determined anything, if *thou* canst not form nor conclude the decision, thou art lost. For thou must not place thy decision on the Pope or any other. Thou must thyself be so skillful that thou canst say, God says this, not that; this is right, that is wrong. Else it is not possible to endure. Dost thou stand upon pope and concilia? Then the devil may at once knock a hole in thee, and insinuate: 'How if it were false; how if they have erred?' Then thou art laid low at once. Therefore, thou must bring *conscience* into play, that thou mayest boldly and defiantly say: 'That is God's word; on that will I risk body and soul and a hundred thousand necks if I had them.'" Again: "Therefore, no one shall turn me from the word which *God* teaches me; and *that must I know* as certainly as that two and three make five, that an ell is longer than a half. That is certain, and, though all the world speak to the contrary, still I know that it is not otherwise. Who decides me there? *No man,* but only the *truth,* which is so perfectly certain that nobody can deny it."

Protestants, then, do not rely upon an external warrant for the divine authority of Scripture. The Reformers maintained that the divinity of Scripture is self-evidencing, and can only be ascertained by the response it awakens in the individual.

But in Scripture there is a distinctive characteristic which no merely internal warrant can assure us of. Scripture is not only authoritative, it is normative. It is not only, though mainly, God's word to the individual, it is God's word to all men collectively. God speaks to us through other channels than Scripture. He speaks in nature, in the external world, and in the conscience of man. He speaks to us day by day through good men, through good books, through our own experience. How many owe their awakening to a sense of God's presence, to the example of a Christian, or to the remonstrance of a friend or preacher! How many a lesson from God has been written for us more legibly in our own life than in any part of Scripture! Not *all* God's word is Scripture. The Spirit of God is not imprisoned in the Bible or limited by it. Romanists and the Society of Friends are right in resolutely maintaining that the Spirit is now alive and active in the impartation of truth. Yet Scripture holds a place of its own among all words of God. What, then, is the difference? What is that which prompts us to call Scripture distinctively the Word of God? We do so because of its direct connection with God's historical revelation which culminated in Christ. It is this which gives it its normative character. It is in some parts of it the very organ of God's revelation of himself in that historical, objective line which led up to Christ; and, in all parts of it, it is, if not the immediate organ, then the direct result of that revelation. It is in the Bible we hear that word of God which it concerns *all God's people in common as a society or church* to know. Here we have the public and common revelation which God has made; that from which all Christian institutions and all Christian hopes spring, and in which all Christians can meet.

Thus accepting the Bible, do we accept it as a whole? Or can we judge each part of Scripture as we judge the whole? Here Protestants divide. Some who admit the validity of the internal response as a test whether this or that book is the word of God, deny its validity as a test whether this or that passage is the word of God. They maintain that once you have ascertained that the Bible, generally, and as a whole, is the Word of God, you must accept every word and letter of it as divinely authoritative. They deny that the test which is valid for the whole is valid for each part. Just as the Romanist exhausts his right of private judgment in one grand decision, when he determines that the Church is an infallible guide, so this type of Protestant exhausts his right of private judgment in the one decision that the Bible is the Word of God. Cautious conservatives see the danger of this position, and leave a way of escape from being quite shut up to it. Perhaps the ablest representative of this class says: "What is fundamental is, that in Scripture, revealing God in Christ, we have a message from God that is supernatural and authoritative; and that Holy Scripture is the instrument of the Holy Ghost for communicating that message and regulating all our thoughts about it. How far the character which attaches to the Revelation, as a whole, is to be ascribed also to every sentence of Scripture, is a subsequent question, the answer to which depends on what Scripture claims for itself, or what it reveals as to the divine method in these communications, and partly also on the experience of the heart in the progressive use of the Bible." No doubt this is a subsequent question, but it is even more pressingly and practically important than the question as to the character of the Bible as a whole. Christians are for the most part agreed that the Bible as a whole contains a message from God: difference of opinion emerges as soon as the same character of supernatural authority is claimed for every part of it. This is resolutely denied by many; and if asked how they can distinguish between what is divinely authoritative and what is not, they would affirm that you must apply the same test to each part that you apply to the whole; that is to say, you must receive as divine all that finds a response in your heart and mind, or, more accurately, all that the Spirit of Christ within you recognizes as proceeding from Christ, and truly representing him. The Reformers did not explicitly treat this point, but there are indications in their writings that show with sufficient plainness that they would have taken this ground. Thus Luther in his preface to the Epistle to the Hebrews does not scruple to say that there are in that Epistle not only gold and precious stones, but wood, hay, and stubble. And in his preface to James he lays down a principle which involves the position that it is not enough that a book be apostolic: "That which does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even though St. Peter or St. Paul should have written it. But that which preaches Christ is always apostolic, even though it be the work of Judas or Annas, of Pilate or of Herod." And when Calvin says, "As God alone is a sufficient witness of himself in his own Word, so also the Word will never gain credit in the hearts of men till it be confirmed by the internal testimony of the Spirit," he certainly seems to have his eye on individual parts or utterances of Scripture and the manner in which these gain credit in the hearts of men. A theologian of more recent times expresses himself thus: "You are not to believe—you cannot believe—either fisherman or doctor, if the assertion itself is contrary to truth, to the laws of your being, to the order and constitution of the universe in which you are living. . . . You cannot believe the words, however habitual and familiar they may be to you, if there is that in them which contradicts the spirit of a man that is in you, which does not address that with demonstration and power."

It will be said, This is first to receive as from God a book, and then to determine how much of God's message I shall receive. It is not so. It is to determine how much of this book is God's message. And to any one who fancies this is to set our own judgment above the Word of God, Luther's scornful words are a sufficient reply: "A goodly argument, forsooth—I approve the Scriptures, *ergo* I am above the Scriptures. John Baptist acknowledgeth and proclaimeth Christ, therefore he is above Christ!"

But, as we found that Scripture as a whole could not be verified as the normative authority in distinction from all other words of God without the application of an external as well as of an internal test; so, in determining what authority attaches to each part of it, we must avail ourselves of the same external aid. These books are the media and the result of God's revelation in history. The New Testament writings, *e.g.*, come to us as the utterances of those who were chosen and trained by Christ to represent him to men. They come, therefore, with a *prima facie* testimony in their favor. We remember our Lord's words, "He that receiveth you receiveth me," and we are disposed to listen to the Apostles as his ambassadors. Moreover, the truth of their writings has been verified in thousands of every generation who have found in them the salvation and the God they craved. No reverence can be too great to feel towards writings that come thus guaranteed. We are thus saved from all extreme of subjectivity. It may be that in some detail I am unable quite to accept what is said, but I am predisposed to learn from these my commissioned teachers, and until an inaccuracy be proved against them, I accept them as authoritative.

We are also saved from extreme individualism by the knowledge that Scripture is for the Church, and not for me alone; and that which seems to me little better than a stone may be to some other person the bread of life. Dr. Dale puts this point with excellent wisdom: "The real power of the New Testament—its 'authority' for myself—must come from those parts of it in which I find God and God finds me; but it does not follow that I am free to say that only in these parts is there any divine light and power. It is easy to understand how Luther came to speak of the Epistle of James as an 'epistle of straw;' it seemed to him to contradict the very substance of what he knew to be the Gospel of Christ. He may be pardoned for his rashness; but still he was rash. Luther was not the measure of all things. Other men were sure that they had heard in that Epistle the voice of God; . . . I distrust the process of 'selection by internal affinity.' It may well be that what does not reach me now will reach me soon. Already I have discovered in the books so much that is wonderful and divine that I am constrained to study them with reverence. I cannot assume equality with Apostles, or coolly criticise the sayings which a great multitude of men, wiser and devouter than myself, have believed to be the sayings of the Son of God. If there are some things which trouble me, I am content to wait till I am compelled to reject them. I know that if I follow Christ I shall not walk in darkness. But if I am guilty of presumption, I may reject what in a little time may be necessary to my very life." These, I think, are words of the truest wisdom.

There are, then, two views current among Protestants regarding the infallibility or divine authority of the Bible. The one view sees in Scripture universal infallibility in each and all of its parts; the other finds in it, taken as a whole, the infallible message of God. The one, consequently, puts each part of Scripture on the same level of divine authority, and forbids all questioning or criticising; all must be accepted, either intelligently or blindly. The other proceeds upon the assumption that all is true, but will by no means be staggered in its faith to find that certain statements must at any rate be received with modifications. Flaws here and there do not at all affect the substance of the book, any more than the cheapness of the earthen jar impoverishes the gold it contains. On the view that infallible truth and divine authority attach to each and every expression of Scripture, there is no room for discussing the relevancy of this or that argument, the accuracy of this or that quotation, the propriety of such and such an expression. The conclusion of all such discussion is a foregone conclusion; and the discussion is a sham. On the view that infallible truth and divine authority attach to Scripture as a whole, we are not concerned to justify any particular argument or statement. On this view the infallible truth of Scripture consists mainly in this, that it will infallibly bring the honest and resolved seeker after truth into the enjoyment of the truth. In Scripture we have the infallible truth about God and his salvation. This position is the mean between two equally untenable positions; it is, on the one hand, impossible to maintain the infallibility of Scripture on the ground of its literal accuracy; and, on the other hand, it is impossible to maintain that the Bible is not infallible because there may be found in it inaccuracies. Its infallibility attaches to its main substance and central message. It infallibly achieves the object for which it was designed.

If not reasonable, it is certainly natural, that men should demand certainty in their knowledge of religious truth. It is also natural that they should seek for that certainty in some guide external to themselves, in some visible index which can be read by all and which is independent of all subjective variations.

This desire for an external infallible guide arises from two characteristics of human nature. The first is the shrinking from responsibility which is so patent in the majority of men. There are men of strong will and blunt sensibilities who without reluctance determine both their own lives and the lives of other men. But the mass of mankind timidly shrink from giving advice to others or from taking steps which must determine their own future. Various are the ways in which men have in all ages tried to shift the burden of decision off their own shoulders—the lot, the oracle, supposed providences, the merest turn of a coin or opening of a book, anything which will give them a pretext for trusting some other force than that of their own reason. If this is so in the ordinary affairs of life, how much more in what concerns eternity are men likely to crave a determination from without rather than from within!

The second characteristic of human nature which leads men to crave an absolute, objective guide is impatience of other men's thoughts and beliefs. Nothing has had so much influence in forming our conception of the Bible as the need of a judge in controversy. So long as a man goes to the Bible only to find his own way to God and to nourish his own soul, it does not occur to him that any stringent theory of infallibility is needed. He seeks for truth, and he finds it. It is only when he begins to urge his views upon other men and becomes impatient at the slowness with which their minds open to the truth that he seeks some external authority by which he can compel them. It is, at bottom, unbelief in spiritual forces which creates this impatient craving for an infallible decision. An external, irresistible authority is sought, an authority easily accessible and easily applied, as if men could not be persuaded and led, could not be trusted to recognize truth when they see it, or even to wish to recognize it.

But whether we have a right to expect a guide in religion to which we have but to commit ourselves in order to be carried on infallibly to truth without questioning, searching, sifting, anxiety, or effort of our own may very well be doubted. Certainly this is not the method God has employed in imparting knowledge other than religious. Men have been allowed to sift the false from the true at the greatest expenditure of time and of life; they have been allowed to make mistakes and to follow these mistakes to their issues; they have been allowed to sacrifice thousands of human lives in every generation to absurd usages and mistaken ideas. It may indeed be urged that in religion the consequence of error is so grave that it cannot be supposed men should be left to any uncertainty here. But may it not rather be argued that it is of so much greater importance that our spiritual energies be elicited than that our physical energies be trained, that it might *a priori* seem very likely that God should not make it impossible for any man, irrespective of his own endeavor and disposition, to miss the truth about Himself?

Even judged *a priori*, then, the craving for external infallible guidance which shall relieve us from all possibility of error, irrespective of our own moral affinities, does not appear to be either an undoubtedly legitimate craving, or likely to be satisfied. But *a priori* arguments here avail us little. Our ideas of what it is likely God will do are apt to go wide of the mark. We might have supposed that God would so reveal himself to all men that they should not be liable to error in divine knowledge. But this, we know, is far from being the case. God has, indeed, not left himself without a witness, but a witness so ambiguous, so difficult to interpret, so easily silenced, that universal knowledge of God has by no means resulted from its testimony.

We may much more safely argue from the facts to God's intention. And there are facts which seem to imply that God did not intend we should have a book which should call forth our faith because of its absolute flawlessness. Such a book we have not got. Even granting that as it left the hands of its writers it was perfect, considerable alterations have been made upon it. It has not been miraculously preserved from the ordinary influences which affect MSS. in the lapse of centuries. The ordinary reader, too, has in it a translation which only inadequately represents the original. So that, were it true that all our faith in Scripture would fall to the ground were one inaccuracy proved, were it true that our assurance that Scripture is God's word depended on our being sure that every word of it is divine, then certainly the English reader could enjoy no such assurance. Had literal accuracy been wanted, literal accuracy would have been secured.

Again, if it had been God's purpose to bring us all to one mind regarding all the details of Christian truth, ought not an infallible interpreter to have been provided? In point of fact, while all Christians believe in the forgiveness of sins and in Christ as mediating that, in the resurrection of the dead, and life eternal, there is little else about which they are agreed, although all use the same book. Romanists are consistent. They see that an infallible interpreter is as much needed as an infallible code and directory. How else can the infallibility reach and affect the individual?

The conclusive proof that the Bible was not meant to be used as a mechanical standard of truth is found in the fact that it is not infallible in all its particular statements. Literal and mechanical accuracy in minute details was evidently not aimed at, or, at all events, has not been attained.

Yet there are persons who say that they give up the Bible altogether if there be one proved error in it; that their salvation depends on the absolute accuracy of every word and sentence from the first verse of Genesis to the last of Revelation. Their salvation, happily, depends on no such thing, and it is the merest infatuation to say it does. If Matthew says our Lord was asked by the people, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day, while in point of fact it was he who asked them that question, is my salvation rendered precarious? That sane men should avow such sentiments and should profess that their faith hangs by so precarious a tenure, might well be stigmatized as irreligious and unchristian were it not so obviously mere thoughtlessness and ignorance. Thank God, our faith depends on a living Person who cannot be separated from us, and who drew to himself and redeemed many before ever there was a written New Testament to quarrel about.

As Frederick Denison Maurice said, "I will not believe any Christian man, even upon his own testimony, who tells me that he should cease to trust in the Son of God because he found chronological or historical misstatements in the Scriptures as great as ever have been charged against them by their bitterest opponents. If I did suspect him of such hollowness, I should pray for him that he might never meet with any travelers or philologers who confirmed the statements of Scripture; none but such as denied them or mocked at them; because the sooner such a foundation is shaken, the better it will be for him."

It will, however, be said these are very minute errors; it is mere trifling to lay such stress on them. No one who studies the Bible can fail to be struck with the manner in which it stands the tests which fresh discoveries from year to year apply to its accuracy. The inaccuracies which do occur, so little touch the substance of the history that one is ashamed to point them out. They are the little cracks or miniature crevasses in the continuous glacier, which a man may step across without noticing them; they do not turn him off his path. If he wantonly thrusts his foot into a hole, he may twist his ankle and prevent further progress, but for the honest man they present no real break or pitfall.

Why, then, notice them? We are compelled to notice them, partly to show how insignificant they are, partly because some, by claiming for the Bible an infallibility it does not possess, have blinded themselves and others to the infallibility it actually has. It is infallible as a guide to those who, with childlike spirit and seeking the truth, follow its light: it actually leads men to Christ. It is infallible in its substance, though not in its form; as a whole, though not in each particular part; in the spirit, though not always in the letter.

These discrepancies are in themselves very trifling, and of absolutely no consequence, but they become of alarming consequence when used as a lever to subvert the infallibility of Scripture. And this they have been made by writers who take advantage of the claim of literal infallibility advanced by well-intentioned persons. This claim is easily disposed of by means of these discrepancies, and the inference is drawn that the infallibility for which we contend does not exist. But literal infallibility is not that which we contend for, and these discrepancies might be multiplied a hundredfold and yet not be inconsistent with true infallibility.

For, first, unimportant errors in detail are never allowed to discredit a historian. The rule "*falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*," is valid in the case of a deliberate falsifier, but absurd if applied to one who errs through lack of knowledge. One who intentionally deceives you, a witness on oath who deliberately gives false evidence, cannot any more be trusted, and the whole of his evidence is discredited. But there is no man who has not occasionally stumbled into error, error at once condoned, and which casts no shadow on his general reputation for truth. Seckendorf is esteemed an unimpeachable authority, yet Seckendorf relates a now exploded legend that Luther was born at Eisleben because his mother had gone there to a fair. Tacitus confounds Agrippa with his brother Herod, King of Chalcis, but are we therefore to read Tacitus with distrust, ever fearful of being led into error? There is no known historian who has not been proved in error, but occasional, unintentional, and unimportant error is lost to view in the general reputation for accuracy which the historian acquires. But what is unimportant error? Is not all error important where divine and eternal interests are concerned? No: else God would have provided for the absence of all error. Error is unimportant when it does not affect the purpose of the whole. Errors in grammar are of no consequence when the sense is unaffected and the meaning remains intelligible. No errors in Scripture are of importance which do not hinder it from conveying to us an adequate apprehension of God's revelation. It must be judged by its fulfillment of its object, and its object was to enable us to apprehend God in Christ and lead us to him. To deny that it has fulfilled this object is too audacious even for skepticism. The Christian ages stand behind us loudly witnessing that Scripture has done its work.

It is on this, then, we found, and here that we find, the "impregnable rock" of Scripture. It does infallibly guide men to Christ. No church can come in between my soul and the figure it presents. No criticism can come in between my soul and that figure. The figure I see in the Gospels, I find also in my life. The same patience and wisdom and divinity that command my adoration in the Gospels shine on my life and give it all the worth and hope it has. Criticism may cut off a fringe or tassel from His garment, but the features and the expressions it cannot touch. They shine with self-evidencing power into every prepared heart.

Other questions remain, some of them of vast importance; but time fails. It is, *e.g.*, feared that if we frankly accept the Reformation principle, it will leave every man to be the judge of what is Scripture and what is not; and that even when a book is acknowledged to be apostolic it remains with the individual to say how much of it he is pleased to receive as God's word. Now, it is remarkable that practically this is already our manner of treating the Bible. Who is at the reader's elbow as he reads Exodus and Leviticus to tell him what is of permanent authority, and what was for the Mosaic dispensation only? Who whispers to us, as we read Genesis and Kings, This is exemplary; this is not? Who sifts for us the speeches of Job, and enables us to treasure as divine truth what he utters in one verse, while we reject the next as Satanic raving? Who gives the preacher authority, who gives him accuracy of aim, to pounce on a sound text in Ecclesiastes, while wisdom and folly toss and roll over one another in confused and inextricable contortions? What enables the humblest Christian to come safely through all the cursing Psalms and go straight to forgive his enemy? What tells us we may eat things strangled, though the whole college of Apostles deliberately and expressly prohibited such eating? Who assures us we need not anoint the sick with oil, though James bids us do so? In a word, how is it that the simplest reader can be trusted with the Bible, and can be left to find his own spiritual nourishment in it? Paul solves the whole matter for us in his bold and exhaustive words: "The spiritual man—the man who has the spirit of Christ—judgeth all things." This, and this only, is the true touchstone by which all things are tried. Let a man accept Christ and live in his Spirit, and there is no fear that he will reject what Christ means he should receive.

THE RIGHT USE OF WEALTH.

BY J. M. BUCKLEY, D.D., LL.D., EDITOR OF "THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE."

From *The Independent* (Undenom.), New York, January 7, 1892.

By some it is held that a rich Christian is an anomaly, little short of a monstrosity, an excrescence upon Christianity, and not a natural, wholesome growth. This view is not ours. The love of money is indeed the root of all evil, and "they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition."

The blessing of the Lord sometimes maketh rich in the literal sense of the words. Abraham and Job were thus made rich. The only charge made by Jesus against the rich was against those who were "rich toward themselves and not toward God." The Apostles recognized distinctions between the rich and the poor: "Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted, and the rich [brother] in that he is made low." The Sermon on the Mount, like the Apostles, tells men not to trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God. But in the discharge of their duty riches may come; hence the Apostolic rule is, every one shall give "as the Lord hath prospered him."

The Christian rule is for men to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." If God gives him only poverty, the disciple must not murmur nor impeach the wisdom or faithfulness of God. If neither poverty nor riches but food convenient for him be sent, he has reason for great thankfulness. If riches increase, he is not to set his heart upon them, but use them properly.

Whatever may be thought of this view it is indisputable that many Christians now possess wealth. Some have inherited fortunes; others have become rich by the increase of property. Such are farmers and others holding real estate by inheritance and by purchase in the outskirts of cities, or which have become sites of towns or cities; the "unearned increment" has made them rich while they waked and while they slept. Such are those upon whose lands, originally of low value, mines of coal, iron, silver, lead, copper, may have been found, or wells of oil and fountains of gas opened. Others have accumulated wealth in their professions as lawyers, physicians, inventors, occasionally journalists, authors; still others beginning as humble mechanics have become manufacturers, employing thousands of men and receiving princely incomes from a small profit upon the labor of each. In a similar way traders have become merchant princes, clerks have developed into great bankers.

To the carrying on of the business in which these men are engaged much surplus wealth is necessary, as a security against changes in the value of raw material, a decline in demand, the effect of competition with the whole world, and as a means of employing those who depend upon the business for a livelihood in times of depression.

All these are stewards of God. This wealth belongs to him. He gave the strength, capacity for wisdom and environment; what men call fortune Christians must call Providence, whereby all these accumulations were made possible. Stewards or agents of men have fixed salaries and receive direct instructions from their principals as to the management of the interests committed to their care; but stewards of God are left to determine by the precepts which he has given how they should live, and by the exercise of their own judgment what use they shall make of what they do not deem necessary or lawful to expend for their subsistence and comfort.

The error of this age is that Christians, like others, fancy that a man's life consisteth in the abundance of the things which he possesseth, and that he is under no responsibility for their use. This error leads men who, in their baptismal vows, "renounce the Devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them," to build great palaces, give great entertainments, and erect monuments of earthly pride. Whereas God asserts his primary ownership: "For she did not know that I gave her corn and wine and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold. . . . Therefore will I return, and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my wine in the season thereof, and will recover my wool and my flax."

The duty, therefore, of the Christian is to reflect how he can use his wealth to promote the kingdom of Christ. His family must be cared for in a proper manner, so as not to rob them of the stimulus to a useful life, or to leave them in danger of actual poverty. His mode of life should be marked by a generous use of the bounties which God has bestowed upon him, but ever being on guard against the insidious sophisms of self-love, he shows how he can make friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness, so that the use of his wealth like his prayers and honest deeds, may increase his blessedness when he shall die in the Lord, and rest from his labors.

The maintenance of the institutions of true religion is first in the order of importance. But it is not the duty of the Christian who possesses wealth so to concentrate it upon a local church as to take from other members the opportunity and the necessity of bearing their portion of the burden. Under ordinary circumstances endowed churches and immense gifts from one or two individuals are not useful in proportion to the amount thus given. In establishing the Gospel in neglected districts, and maintaining mission work where the indigenous resources are not adequate, such gifts wisely applied are among the most effective means of promoting the glory of God through the highest welfare of men.

Education presents a field to which now there is a fashionable tendency, and institutions to promote it are among the noblest exhibitions of Christian philanthropy which adorn the present age. Not the least among them is the recent attempt to give to all classes the opportunity of acquiring manual training, which had been taken from the sons of the poor by the abolition of the apprentice system, and the restrictions imposed by trades unions.

I would direct the attention of those interested in such considerations to a kind of beneficence which has these excellent characteristics ; it is most certainly needed, its effects are invariably good, it is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Christ. Its best illustrations are seen in hospitals, orphanages, and homes for the aged.

That the sick and the wounded should be tenderly cared for, and if possible restored to health, there can be no question. That the fatherless and motherless should find in Christian training and affection the substitute for paternal and maternal care is a direct conclusion from the very existence of Christianity ; that the aged, whose steps halt feebly to the tomb, who are deprived of the capacities of usefulness and of enjoyment, should be honored for their gray hairs, and comforted in their "age and feebleness extreme" is self-evident. Let the untutored Indian, whose life depends upon physical strength, and whose resources are few, lead out into the forest his decrepit ancestors to die, but let not the Christian allow virtuous age to beg its bread. In this he should do good unto all men as he has opportunity, especially unto them that be of the household of faith.

No return in the support of a hospital is to be expected, except from a few patients who avail themselves of its superior facilities in particular cases. The great majority are like the man whom the good Samaritan relieved, recipients without being able to repay.

Orphans may indeed and often do remember, when they prosper, the homes which benevolence gave them ; but not many of them, debarred as they are the support which comes from connection with prosperous families in the enterprises of life, attain considerable wealth. The aged already far along in the retrograde changes the end of which is death, must receive the last gratuity when they are unconscious of it, as their eyes are closed and their bodies decently interred by those who have ministered to their helplessness.

It would seem, therefore, that those who are in doubt what to do with their wealth might well resolve that doubt by selecting from these three classes for which the State does not and cannot make adequate provision, the Hospital, the Orphanage, the Home for the Aged, a suitable object for the appropriation as agents and stewards, of a portion of the at present uninvested treasures left by divine Providence on deposit with them.

NEW YORK CITY.

BY ROBERT S. MAC ARTHUR, D.D.

From *The Independent* (Undenom.), New York, January 7, 1892.

FEW questions are more practical and important to-day than the proper use of wealth. America is fast becoming the richest nation of the world ; and many thoughtful Americans, having recently become possessed of wealth, are more perplexed as to its right use than are the people of older countries, who have longer been accustomed to its possession. Great wealth is an enormous power for good or evil. Its possession is itself the obligation to its right use. The wrong use of wealth is a crime against its possessor and against society. As much skill is often required in the right disposition of wealth as in its accumulation. It is really as difficult to make a good investment for the Lord as for one's self. We are familiar with the old phrase, *Noblesse oblige.* This legend teaches us that worthy descent, noble blood and high position of whatever kind demand corresponding character and service. The time has come for us to coin and to emphasize another phrase —*Richesse oblige.* Each new possession implies a new responsibility. A man does not possess wealth to himself, any more than he can live to himself in any position. Mr. A. T. Stewart's inability to make a wise disposition of his money was one of the sad failures of his life. He showed more skill in its acquisition than in its wise disposition. It is difficult to lay down principles of universal application regarding the disposition of money. That a man owes something to society no one will doubt; and that he ought to discharge this obligation in some form, every one will admit.

That a man ought to give liberally, and give in his lifetime, will be insisted upon in this article. This he ought to do, in the first place, because of the influence of giving upon the giver himself. Giving for Christian or any humane work is not simply a duty, it is a privilege. It is not simply a privilege, it is a glory. It develops manhood. It makes the giver a taller, broader, deeper man; it puts him into sympathy with his fellow-man the world over; it makes him tenfold more a man. Many men are moral dwarfs who might be giants. They live in the malarial valleys of their own mean and selfish natures, when they might breathe the mountain air, and bask in the divine sunshine of noble deeds. They sing their *Miserere,* born of selfish withholding; they might sing the *Te Deum,* inspired by generous bestowment. Such men are to be pitied; they are also to be severely blamed. Did not our religion prevent we would despise them. No man has a right to be a moral dwarf; no man has a right to commit moral suicide. Every man ought to be as man like as possible; every man ought to be as God-like as possible. God is the eternal giver; did he cease to give, he would cease to be God. They who cease to give cease to be God-like. The Dead Sea is the Dead Sea because it always takes in and never gives out. Geographers tell us that it has no outlet, visible or invisible. Lifeless it lies beneath the scorching sun. The man who refuses to give for Christ and his cause soon becomes a dead man. Think of a church made up of such men! God pity a warm-hearted, Christ-loving man who happens to be the pastor of such people! Such a church needs training. But it seems almost hopeless to attempt to train men and women who have grown old and rich in wicked withholding. Refusing to give intensifies disinclination to give. To nurse selfishness is to produce moral decay.

A man of wealth ought to give also for the sake of his family. It is often said that men ought to hoard up their money for the good of their children. It ought oftener to be said that men ought to give with a liberal hand for the good of their children. Many a man inflicts the greatest possible wrong upon his children when he makes them possessors of great wealth for which they have never toiled. Families could be named in this city whose sons have never added anything to the world's wealth in money, in intellect, in culture, or in any other form of helpful living. They simply spend what their fathers selfishly and foolishly hoarded. Some of these children live fast and injurious lives; others live simply negative lives, doing absolutely nothing to help their fellow-men. They do not really live; they simply exist. They are ciphers in this busy, toiling and suffering world. It is difficult not to hold such men in contempt. If they had to work, as their fathers did, the necessity would be a divine benediction. Had their fathers given their wealth to educational, charitable, and distinctively missionary institutions, they would have conferred a blessing upon their children as well as upon the direct objects of their benevolence. Americans are especially exposed to the danger of possessing large wealth thus inherited. In older countries that danger has been to a considerable degree avoided. There the fine old phrase already quoted, *Noblesse oblige,* has greater authority. In our country we have not yet reached that stage of social development. Some of these unfortunate children have neither capacity nor desire for study; and they will not work in business as their fathers did a generation ago. Their club is their university and their church. Their talk is trivial, if not coarse. They are a reproach to American life and to the civilization of the nineteenth century. There are, it is joyfully admitted, honorable exceptions in business life and in political activity, but the regret is that the exceptions are so rare. In the Old World a great change has taken place in this respect within half a century. Now the sons of nobility are taking hold of business. The Marquis of Lorne spends part of his leisure in making a translation of the Psalms of David ; the son of the Queen part of his leisure in writing music. It may not be music of a very high order ; but it is worth something to have him make music or do anything else of an intellectual kind. The daughter of the Queen weds the son of a Duke, honored for his literary attainments and business pursuits as for his long line of ancestors. It is felt that something else than fox-hunting and other forms of pleasure-seeking is needed to secure a respectable standing with the thinking classes of society. Remove from the Duke of Argyle all the glory of his ancestral fame and estates, and he will still stand before the world as the author of books representing the ripe results of science in harmony with the teachings of religion. Similar remarks would apply to Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Lecky, Mr. Balfour, and many others. On no heraldic crutches may any man strut across the stage of life to-day. The world rightly insists that every man shall do and be something to justify his claim upon the consideration and honor of society. It is a reproach to a man's family, as well as a dishonor to his own memory, for him to leave them millions while he leaves nothing, or at most but a few thousands, of his wealth to the cause of God and man. If he had a proper regard for the good of his own name, and for the honor of his family, he would make a far different disposition of his wealth. It is not too much to say that no man is properly prepared to die who leaves millions to his family and but a few thousands to all forms of benevolence. The time has come for the creation of a sentiment making such a disposition of one's property dishonorable to himself and dishonoring to his family. The time has come for the pulpit and press to teach this truth.

Society has claims upon a man as well as his family. However successful a man may be in acquiring property, he is, after all, only a factor in its production. The increase of value in property is often to be attributed to the wisdom of others as truly as to that of the man himself. The natural increase in the value of property places each property holder under obligations to use a part of his possessions for the good of society. Men of wealth are debtors to the community as truly as, and often more really than, are poor men. Intellectual wealth comes under the same law. Intellectual miserliness may be as real and almost as degrading as the inordinate love of money. A man who has made vast intellectual acquirements ought to give the world the benefit of his attainments as truly as the man of wealth. The Apostle Paul recognized his indebtedness to the untutored barbarians as well as to the cultured Greeks ; his ability to help both created the obligation to render that help. A man in refusing the claims of society may be inflicting irreparable injury upon his own children. Society is one ; the solidarity of a community and of the race must be recognized. Whatever hurts any part of the community hurts the entire community. There is a consolidation of interests and a fellowship of responsibilities. The hand, the foot and the eye are inseparable parts of the one integral body. A man may say : "I must spend this money to improve the home and the grounds about the home of my children." No one will object to this use of a portion of his property, but not far from his home is an enormous bog emitting constantly malarial poisons. Is it not equally his duty to his children to unite with his neighbors in draining that bog, and thus purify the atmosphere which they all breathe ? Can he do a greater kindness to his children than to drain that bog ? But society abounds in moral bogs, emitting the most deadly moral poisons. Can a man do better than to use a large portion of his wealth in draining these moral bogs ? In harmony with this principle every business man in the city of New York ought to be interested in all forms of city mission work. Mission stations are the best police forces in the community. Real estate was not worth much in Sodom and Gomorrah on the morning of the day when the Lord determined to destroy them with fire and brimstone. Old Dr. South was right when he said : "If we had not places in which the breakers of man's law should be confined, we should need to multiply places in which the breakers of man's law should be confined." The unmistakable mutterings of communism can best be silenced by the manifestations of a true Christianity in many practicable forms. Jesus Christ was a workingman. He is the true friend of workingmen everywhere. They commit their greatest blunder when they turn away from Christ and his Church, but the Church has also often blundered in refusing them consideration and fraternal sympathy. Never were the opportunities greater for the right investment of wealth than now. Steamships, railroads, telegraphs and telephones have girdled the world. Africa is to-day at our doors, and India is as near to us now as Britain was but a little time ago. The Christianization of Africa and other heathen lands opens wide doors to the commerce of America. Every cotton mill in New England is financially interested in every mission station in Africa. No man is worthy the honors given to an intelligent American citizen who is not interested in the establishment of missions, and in the Christianization of the world. The man who affirms his indifference in this respect simply announces his ignorance and inhumanity in many respects. The man of wealth cannot shut up his heart and his pocket against the cry of suffering women in heathen lands, the victims of ignorant and superstitious medical practitioners, of helpless children crying for light and knowledge, and of great masses of men who might soon be transformed from barbarians into intelligent citizens. Never were there such opportunities as to-day for the right use of wealth in missions at home and abroad. We can have both home and foreign missions on Manhattan Island. To be simply a good citizen a man must be an intelligent giver to every form of divine and humane work.

We are now prepared to advance a step :

Men ought to give in their lifetime, except so far as the withdrawal of large amounts of money might seriously injure their business. There is often but little generosity in leaving large sums in one's will ; it is generally pure selfishness which makes men hold on to their money until death relaxes their grasp. There may be also great folly as well as selfishness and miserliness in this procedure. Recent events have shown that it is well-nigh impossible for the greatest lawyers to draw wills which heirs by the aid of other great lawyers and courts cannot break. It may also be assumed that the average heir will forget the claims of generosity toward society, and of respect toward the dead in order to gratify his selfish ambition. In this way New York City lately has lost large sums of money given for public uses. Men are unspeakably foolish to take the chances of giving money in this way. They ought also to have the joy which comes from seeing their gifts rightly used ; they ought also to superintend the investments of their gifts so as to secure their utmost safety and productiveness. The ability which they have shown in acquiring money they ought to continue to show in the management of that money when given to educational and other benevolent institutions. Standing before a historic monument in London, Matthew Vassar read the words "In his lifetime," and immediately conceived the idea of giving of his wealth in his own lifetime for the founding of Vassar College. His example is worthy of general imitation. Mr. John D. Rockefeller, in his recent gift of millions to the University of Chicago and to other educational institutions, has set an equally worthy example. So has Mr. James B. Colgate in his more recent gift of $1,000,000 to Colgate University. Both Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Colgate have given their varied and ripe business experience toward the judicious investment of their gifts, and toward the management of these institutions. It is difficult to overstate the importance of giving in this way, or the folly of leaving large amounts in doubtful wills, creating painful contests, alienating families, robbing needy institutions, and only enriching lawyers already wealthy.

Great folly is often shown also in the building of enormously expensive monuments over the dead. Friends of the writer have lately endowed scholarships in women's colleges as monuments to their deceased wives ; this course is eminently wise. Young women will continue to be educated from the annual income of these investments, and will thus be living monuments to the memory of the departed. Surely such a course is vastly wiser than spending the money in erecting stately piles of marble and granite over the dead. We are warranted in saying that no better use can be made of money than expending it either in direct mission work or in founding and managing great institutions for Christian education. New England gained her great place in this Republic because of the attention which she gave to education. The people who first came into New England contained an unusually large proportion of English university men ; this was especially true of the ministers. These educated ministers altho' dead still speak and act ; they created the mold into which their descendants have been run ; they have made New England felt throughout America and throughout the world. When these university-bred men died, there was a noble body of men bred in American colleges ready to take their places.

The great colleges founded in that early day have been the bulwarks of education, of liberty and of religion. The man who founds by money or brains a great university, which remains loyal to truth and God, does more to bless men and to honor God than man or angel can estimate. He founds the most enduring institution known this side of God's throne. Oxford and Cambridge have outlived political earthquakes; they will outlive all possible national cataclysms. They are more enduring than the British throne. It is conceivable that a Republic may take the place one day of the British monarchy; but amid the crash of thrones and dynasties, should this change come, these great universities will stand unmoved. Empires may rise and fall, dynasties change and decay, but these institutions of learning shall be like mighty lighthouses resting on the eternal rock, and sending out the light of science and religion, blended into one flame, to illumine the world and to glorify God.

Few subjects which *The Independent* has discussed, or can discuss, are of greater practical moment than the one presented in this symposium. More and more will wealth increase in this great Republic; more and more must we judge men by their generosity toward God and man. God must have a very poor opinion of the selfishness of creatures who live for themselves alone; it is certain that intelligent men have come to estimate such at their true value. Lord Bacon was right when he said: "Defer not charities till death, for certainly if a man weigh it rightly he that does so is rather liberal of another man's than his own." God loveth a cheerful giver, as the Scripture teacheth us. So do men. Only as we have the spirit of the Lord Jesus, who, tho' rich for our sakes became poor, can we have the highest honors from men and the approving smile of God the great giver.

NEW YORK CITY.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD IN PREDESTINATION.

AS HELD BY MANY REPRESENTATIVE CALVINISTIC THEOLOGIANS.

BY PRESIDENT G. W. NORTHRUP, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Standard* (Cong.), Chicago, January 14, 1892.

AMONG those conceptions of the divine sovereignty which have prevailed more or less widely we notice the following:

1. The sovereignty of God is his right to govern the universe according to the decisions of his arbitrary will. Creatures have no claims in equity upon God, and he is under no obligation to them, except such as he has freely assumed by promise or in some other way. "His absolute dominion regards not any qualities or conditions of its objects, but he can in virtue thereof inflict the highest torments upon the innocent and exempt from punishment the most guilty.

2. Another representation is that God by virtue of his absolute sovereignty decrees and effects everything which comes to pass, that his will is the sole efficient cause in the universe, as well in the realm of mind as in that of matter, working irresistibly to will and to do both in the evil and the good. Emmons—"It is as consistent with the moral rectitude of the Deity to produce sinful as holy exercises in the minds of men. He puts forth a positive influence to make moral agents act, in every instance of their conduct, as he pleases."

3. By the sovereignty of God is sometimes meant simply his independence and supremacy—the truth that by nothing outside of himself is he limited in his authority and sway over his creatures.

4. The term is often used to denote the fact that the reasons of God's acts are unrevealed. Wardlaw—"All that I mean by the sovereignty of God is that he does not see fit to reveal the reasons of his acts." Cunningham—"The Arminians virtually deny the sovereignty of God by undertaking and proposing to assign the reasons of all his dealings with men."

5. A very common statement is that the sovereignty of God is "his absolute right to govern and dispose of all his creatures simply according to his own good pleasure," or according to his absolute perfection.

OTHER CONCEPTIONS OF GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY.

Setting aside the first two of the above views as not worthy of consideration, we remark that in neither of the others do we find clearly indicated the element characteristic of the doctrine of God's sovereignty as accepted by many representative Calvinists. All theologians will admit that God is supreme and independent, that he often acts from reasons which are unrevealed, and that his will is always exercised in harmony with his nature. There is, however, a radical difference of view as to the true nature of God's absolute perfection,—some divines predicating of him, as an essential excellency, a principle of action which others affirm to be not only no excellency at all, but inconsistent with any worthy view of his character. The idea of the divine sovereignty to which we refer may be indicated in the following way: There is in God, if we may so speak, a twofold principle of action, by virtue of which some of his acts are morally necessary, while others are optional. In requiring perfect obedience of all moral agents, in exercising complacency towards the holy, in punishing the incorrigible, according to their wickedness—in these and similar ways God acts not according to his discretion, but under the behest of his absolute holiness or righteousness. But in purposing to create the universe, to permit the fall of some of the angels and of Adam, in deciding to whom of the human race to extend, and from whom to withhold, renewing grace—in these and like matters God acts as a sovereign, " being absolutely free to will or not will, and to will the precise opposite of that which he does will."

In exercising the prerogative of sovereignty his acts are optional, while in meeting the demands of holiness or righteousness his acts are necessary in the sense that no other course is morally possible.

Shedd—" Sovereignty denotes optional power; that is, the power to act or not in a given instance. A sovereign that has no alternative is none at all. God is a sovereign and the highest of all. He may create a universe or not as he pleases. Were he obliged or compelled to create he would not be sovereign in creating. He may arrange and order his universe as he pleases. If he were confined to but one order he would not be sovereign in his providence. In his election of a sinner to salvation, God as supreme, independent, and sovereign, acts with entire liberty of decision, and not as shut up to one course."

Hill, Lectures in Divinity, (page 562)—" It must be admitted upon the Calvinistic system that God might have prevented this deviation and this suffering; that as no dire necessity restrains the Almighty from communicating any measure of grace to any of his creatures, the unmerited favor which was shown to some might have been shown to others also; and therefore, that all the variety of transgression, and the consequent misery of his creatures, may be traced back to the unequal distribution of that grace which he was not bound to impart to any, but which, although he might have imparted it to all, he chose to give only to some."

Edwards, (IV. 548)—1. " God can, without prejudice to the glory of any of his attributes, bestow salvation on any of the children of men, except on those who have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost"—an exception which he made in the exercise of his sovereign discretion. 2. " He may refuse salvation to any sinner whatsoever without prejudice to the honor of any of his attributes."

WHAT SUCH CONCEPTIONS INVOLVE.

But it is needless to multiply quotations from representative Calvinistic writers, expressing or implying the same idea of the divine sovereignty. Edwards is one of the most penetrating, logical, and luminous thinkers in the history of the church, and in the sermon referred to he sets forth in a full and powerful way the doctrine of God's sovereignty as a prerogative in the exercise of which he is entirely free, as we have said, to will the precise opposite of that which he does will in the case of any individual. He remarks that, " if it would in itself be prejudicial to any of his attributes to bestow or refuse salvation, then God would not in that matter act as absolutely sovereign; it would then cease to be a merely arbitrary thing, or a matter of absolute liberty." An act of sovereignty is, then, " a merely arbitrary thing," " a matter of absolute liberty," the exact opposite of which is equally in his power, and would involve no prejudice to the honor of any of his attributes. According to this representation God does not and cannot act as a sovereign except in cases in which two or more courses of action are morally possible, or consistent with his perfections. If, then, there are several courses of action which are optional with God, they must be equally excellent, equally worthy of himself. For to suppose that he does or can adopt a less in preference to a more wise and glorious mode of procedure, would impugn his absolute perfection. We must, then, regard the following propositions as true:

1. God decreed to elect a part of mankind and to reprobate the rest, and remains God, infinitely blessed and glorious.

2. Had he reversed these decrees as regards the individuals included in them, electing those whom he reprobated, and reprobating those whom he elected, he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious.

3. Had he decreed to include in either of these purposes any number of individuals less than the whole human race, he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious.

4. Had he decreed the damnation of all, he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious.

5. Had he decreed the salvation of all,

he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious.

WHAT THEY REQUIRE US TO ACCEPT.

Let us consider, now, what view of the character of God these propositions require us to accept. Having made an atonement sufficient for the whole world, God is now able, acting in complete harmony with his infinite perfections, to bestow salvation on all mankind,—those only excepted who have committed the unpardonable sin,—which exception he was entirely free not to make : and yet, notwithstanding the amplitude of the provisions of grace, he can refuse salvation to a part or all mankind, acting in a manner equally honorable and glorious. The Scriptures teach that he will bring "a great multitude which no man can number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues" to the summit of finite honor and blessedness, fitted and destined to be forever with Jesus Christ, the witnesses of his exaltation and the sharers of his glory. We would inquire, now, if it would be speaking of God "the thing that is right," to say that it was optional with him—morally possible for him—a procedure that would have involved no violence to any principle of his nature—to have decreed to make an atonement in Jesus Christ, and yet, to consign to a state of everlasting sin and misery this great multitude, in whose regeneration, sanctification, and glorification, every divine perfection is displayed in the most impressive and glorious manner? The Scriptures also teach that a part—apparently a large part—of our race, "shall go away into everlasting punishment," every one of whom is certain to commit more acts of sin and to endure more suffering than have been committed and endured by all beings in the universe since "the angels that sinned were cast down to hell." Again, we would inquire if we are bound to believe that it was optional with God—morally possible for him—a procedure which would have involved no violence to any principle of his nature—to have decreed the everlasting holiness and felicity of this multitude, in which case every one of them would perform more holy acts, and enjoy more happiness than have been performed and enjoyed in the universe since the first rational spirits cried one to another, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!"

These questions, we are told, are to be answered in the affirmative. If God had decreed to consign to the inconceivable horrors of hell all those "whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life," and if he had decreed to bring to the ineffable glories of heaven those to whom Christ will say: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," he would have acted, it is affirmed, in a manner equally wise and worthy of himself as the creator and governor of the universe. But do the Scriptures warrant us in ascribing to God a prerogative in the exercise of which he is free—morally, absolutely free—to act in the way here indicated,—to ordain to dishonor and wrath any part of our race, when able to bring all to a state of eternal blessedness, acting in harmony with every principle of his nature? Is it credible that God, who so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to the shame and agony of the cross in order to accomplish its redemption, would or could consign to eternal death any whom he could ordain to eternal life, without departing one iota from the most wise and perfect method of moral government? In our judgment to suppose that he has done, or could have done this would contradict our necessary idea of his absolute perfection. And if God decreed the damnation of a part of our race, every one of whom he could have decreed to save, without prejudice to the glory of any of his attributes—his power, or wisdom, or independence, or immutability, or truth, or holiness, or justice, or righteousness, or benevolence, or mercy, or patience—we challenge any one to suggest a reason for his action which would not involve, logically, the denial of his benevolence. Observe that the question here presented is not the one with which the Calvinistic system is supposed to be burdened and which necessarily baffles our intelligence, why of two individuals between whom there is *no* difference as regards the reasons of his action God elects one and passes by the other; but why he reprobates any, seeing that he is free and able in every legitimate sense of these terms—metaphysically and morally free and able on the ground of the atonement, to bring to the perfection and glory of the heavenly world the whole human race—leaving none of them "to dwell with the devouring fire," none "to be cast into hell, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth," none to call in vain to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne and from the wrath of the lamb." If of the five propositions stated above, the last were true, the salvation of all men would be in our judgment, as certain as the existence of God; but the acceptance of all of them as true—which the theory under consideration requires—necessarily implies that all of them are false ; that is, that God is not infinitely blessed and glorious in perfection, but is wholly destitute of benevolence, and consequently of every moral excellence—having only the metaphysical properties of self-existence, independence, intelligence, and almighty will.

REASONS EXAMINED.

Let us examine some of the reasons which are urged in vindication of the benevolence of God in decreeing the damnation of a part of mankind though entirely free to decree the salvation of all.

1. It is urged that God has an absolute right to exercise justice in dealing with mankind involved in sin and guilt. But the mere right to exercise justice would not render its actual exercise consistent with benevolence if it were optional with him, if he were entirely free, to exercise his mercy in the case of every human being—as free to bring all as a part of our race to the awards of the heavenly world.

2. It is held that divine justice would be more clearly and impressively illustrated by the everlasting punishment of a part of mankind than it could be in case all were to be saved. But this supposition contradicts the theory which affirms that the honor of no one of the divine attributes would be diminished or prejudiced by the decree of universal salvation, but that all of them would be as gloriously manifested in the salvation of all men, as they would in the salvation of a part and the destruction of a part.

The atonement is an infinitely glorious illustration of the justice of God ; it is as the apostle declares (Rom. iii. 25, 26), a perfect theodicy, clearing the character of God in relation to the moral scandal which our world presents, and so satisfying his righteous indignation against mankind that he can "himself be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." And who can doubt that if God can glorify himself equally in the manifestation of wrath and of mercy in dealing with men, he will, in every instance, manifest his mercy, for the exercise of mercy is, while the exercise of wrath is not, congenial to his nature. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." It is of course true, that if men go on in sin and die impenitent justice must demand that they be punished according to their guilt ; but this fact has no bearing on the question before us, for the theory declares that there was no demand of justice forbidding God to regenerate and pardon these same persons.

3. It is said that it is the will of God to manifest his sovereignty and that his sovereignty like his other attributes is manifested in the exercise of it (Edwards.) But if God should pardon all men his acts would be as truly acts of sovereignty as they would be in case he should pardon a part and refuse to pardon the rest.

Should it be urged, however, as it commonly is that divine sovereignty must be manifested both in the way of wrath and of mercy in order that its true nature may be most clearly and impressively revealed, we would inquire :

(1) If the reprobation of one individual, or at most a few hundred, representing classes ranging from the lowest to the highest in guilt, would not be sufficient to answer the end here suggested—the display of sovereignty in the way of wrath ?

(2) If it were *necessary* for God in order to make the most perfect self revelation, to exercise his sovereignty in consigning to hell such and so many of our race as are included in the purpose of reprobation, how could it have been *optional* with him to decree the salvation of any one of this number ? Is it optional with God to reveal himself otherwise than in the most perfect manner ? And if it is optional with him to do this, how far would he be free to go in making an imperfect self-revelation ? to the extent that the revelation would have no excellency at all ?

4. It is held by many that the reprobation of a part of mankind is not only consistent with, but required by, infinite benevolence. This is the view of those theologians who regard benevolence as the fundamental ethical perfection of God. According to this theory God is determined in all his dealings with angels and with mankind, by supreme regard for the greatest good of creation. He purposed to save every man whom he could save consistently with this end. Had he decided to save the whole world, or to save one man, more or less, than he will in fact save, he would have defeated the end of infinite benevolence, choosing an inferior instead of a superior good, which would be a denial of himself. But it would be difficult to advance an idea more profoundly repugnant to our deepest moral convictions than to say that God decreed the everlasting sin and anguish of a large part, or even of one, of the human race, in order to secure to the rest a higher degree of felicity. And yet many have so conceived and represented

"him whose nature and whose name is Love." A theologian of fame in the latter part of the eighteenth century, could write: "The blessing of election, somewhat like the Sibylline books, rises in value, proportionately to the fewness of its objects." According to this notion, it would seem that to be embraced in the infinite and everlasting love of God, would be a blessing hardly worth having if all men were to share in it; and that, since the "great salvation" rises in value, "proportionately to the fewness of its objects," it would reach its maximum value, in case only one person should obtain the felicity and glory of the heavenly world. So holy men of old thought and wrote of God and "his unspeakable gift." But it is obvious that this theory, based on the idea of benevolence as fundamental in God, is utterly inconsistent with the ascription to him of an optional power in dealing with men; for the law of benevolence, which is the rule of all his acts, determined the decrees of election and reprobation, as regards both the number and the particular individuals to be included in each.

5. It is conjectured that there may be some unrevealed and inconceivable principle in the nature of God in virtue of which he refuses to pardon a part of our race. But this unknown principle, whatever it may be, since it leaves him entirely free in relation to all men to exercise mercy in which he infinitely delights, cannot move him to exercise wrath in which he solemnly declares that he has no pleasure.

FALLACIES IN THE REASONING.

All these attempts to reconcile the action of God, in dealing with those who perish, with his infinite benevolence are necessarily rendered futile by the irrational and unscriptural nature of the assumption which they are designed to justify—viz.: that God ordained to dishonor and wrath those whom he was absolutely free to ordain to eternal life—whom he could have purposed to renew and sanctify and glorify, acting in harmony with every principle of his being.

Dr. Shedd asks: "What *sovereignty* has God in the salvation of a sinner, if he has no alternative in regard to election, regeneration and pardon, if eternal justice requires that he elect and forbids that he pass by; if eternal justice requires that he regenerate, and forbids that he leave in unregeneracy; if eternal justice requires that he pardon and forbids that he refuse to pardon?"

We think Dr. Shedd in error in supposing that the rejection of the notion of divine sovereignty which he defends, compels, logically, the admission that *eternal justice* requires God to elect, regenerate and pardon sinners. Suppose we substitute "infinite wisdom" for "eternal justice" in the above quotation, it will then read: "What *sovereignty* has God in the salvation of the sinner if infinite wisdom requires that he elect and forbids that he pass by; if infinite wisdom requires that he regenerate and forbids that he leave in unregeneracy; if infinite wisdom requires that he pardon and forbids that he refuse to pardon?"

Is it reasonable and scriptural to believe that in deciding to adopt the existing plan of creation God was guided by his infinite wisdom, by his absolute perfection, so that this plan, embracing the universe in its whole extent and everlasting duration, including all his acts in relation to angelic intelligence, holy and apostate, and in relation to the human race in their unfallen state, and in their state of sin and guilt, and of gracious probation, is the most wise and perfect plan which the infinite mind of God could conceive? If this representation is reasonable and scriptural, then it is right to say, that the infinite wisdom, the absolute perfection of God, required him to include in the purpose of election such and so many men as are actually included in it, and to include in the purpose of reprobation such and so many men as are actually included in it; that had he decreed to elect or reprobate one more or less, or to reprobate one of those whom he elected, or to elect one of those whom he reprobated, he would have acted less wisely and less worthily of himself, and, therefore, inconsistently with his infinite perfection.

If this position is correct, it was not optional with God, in the sense in which the term is commonly used, to elect all men, or to reprobate all men, or to elect those whom he reprobated, and to reprobate those whom he elected. The decisive question here is not, what claims, in equity man has upon God, or what are his rights in relation to them, but what is most congruous with God's essential being; what is his obligation to himself, as the all-perfect creator and governor of the universe, to satisfy the promptings of his love, so far as he can do so, acting in harmony with all his other perfections. Love is an essential and infinitely glorious attribute of God, whose mighty impulses he will infallibly satisfy—must needs satisfy—unless restrained by some behest arising from his absolute holiness. When we once consider how profoundly opposed sin is to the holy nature of

God, the urgency of his entreaties and expostulations with sinners, crying out night and day, "O, do not that abominable thing which I hate"; the fierceness of his indignation against those who trample upon his laws and defy his authority; his amazing self-sacrifice in Jesus Christ to render the exercise of mercy possible; the inconceivably dreadful doom of apostate angels and of the incorrigible of our race,—hell with its horrors of outer darkness, and of everlasting fear, and shame, and regret, and remorse, and despair,—we are constrained to reject the theory which finds the explanation of this awful reality in the notion of the divine sovereignty as a prerogative whose exercise is optional in the sense in which it is held by representative Calvinistic theologians, and to believe that nothing short of some absolute impossibility, metaphysical or moral, could have prevented God from decreeing the regeneration and pardon of all mankind, and their everlasting holiness and happiness.

STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE AS PREFERRED.

The sovereignty of God is his right and power to constitute and govern the universe according to his absolute ethical perfection: it implies supremacy, independence, and infinite moral excellency, but not optional power in the sense that he is entirely free to will the exact opposite of that which he does will. He exercised his sovereignty in adopting the plan of the existing universe because of its supreme excellency as including those methods of action most worthy of himself. It is an assumption for the support of which there is no evidence accessible to the human mind, that there were other plans precisely equal to the one adopted in point of perfection as expressive of the mind and heart of God; or that he has ever performed, or ever will or can perform an act, the opposite of which, viewed in all its relations and bearings, would be equally wise and excellent, equally befitting himself as infinitely benevolent and absolutely holy.

God is a sovereign and the highest of all, not because he possesses a prerogative in the exercise of which he is free to choose any one of an infinity of systems of creation, whether equal or unequal, in point of excellency; but because he possesses the power and the right to govern and dispose of all his creatures according to the dictates of his infinite intelligence, making himself his own highest law, and highest good, and highest end. We deny that the Bible justifies the ascription to God of a prerogative in virtue of which he was entirely free to ordain to eternal life those whom he will consign to the congenial companionship of the devil and his angels.

It is as self-evident as any truth in mathematics that a perfect human father, remaining such, could not but pursue a course which would win back to virtue and happiness his wayward son, in case he knew infallibly that course to be consistent with the best interests of the universe and the highest glory of God. And it cannot be less certain that our heavenly Father, of whose love for his disobedient children the most perfect human love is but an infinitely inadequate illustration, will save every one whom it is optional with him to save—every one whom he knows he can save consistently with the best interests of his universal kingdom, and without prejudice to the glory of any of his attributes.

This position does not contradict nor is it in any degree inconsistent with, the teaching of Scripture, that salvation is in every instance in which it is bestowed a matter of pure and unbounded grace,—the mighty constraint of divine love enhancing immeasurably the graciousness of its expression towards those who deserve nothing but the retribution of divine justice.

According to the teaching of the scriptures there is in God a principle of absolute ethical limitation or self restraint. He cannot deny himself; he cannot lie; he cannot be tempted with evil; he cannot give his glory to another. It is because of this principle or quality of the nature of God which renders it impossible that he should do what is unbefitting or unworthy of himself, that all agree in making affirmations like the following: God cannot command essential wickedness, as malevolence, ingratitude, selfishness; he cannot make the wicked happy in their wickedness; he cannot punish wrong-doers more than they deserve; he cannot require of unfallen beings more than he qualifies them to perform, etc. This principle of morally necessary self-restraint is not a limitation in the proper sense of the term; it is not a fetter on the life of God, but is essential to the highest freedom; he would not be more, but infinitely less, perfect if he could deny himself. The principle of God's self-limitation or self-restraint is not his love or his holiness, but his absolute ethical perfection of which holiness and love are the essence and which is the rule and law of his will in all its acts in creation, providence, and redemption. We have here, not a mere hypothesis, nor an idea derived from theological speculation, but a clear truth of revelation, a principle of moral government, which the scriptures ascribe to God and from which they declare he cannot depart. And it is on the ground of this fundamental truth of inspiration that we affirm our conviction that God will do the utmost that he can do to save every member of our race; the utmost that he can do having due regard to the universal and everlasting interests of his kingdom and the glory of his name; that he will consign no man to hell whom he could bring to heaven and remain God; no man whom he could "present faultless before the presence of his glory," acting in accordance with the most perfect system of moral government, with the supreme law of his absolute ethical perfection.

The sovereignty of God is the immutable foundation of the stability and moral order of the universe, and of the security and felicity of all holy beings. "And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." The divine sovereignty should be the source of the greatest encouragement and hope as well as of fear to sinners; of hope in assuring them that God is seeking the salvation of all men with infinite wisdom and love; and of fear in teaching that there are limits beyond which God as all-perfect will not—cannot go—even to the putting forth of one act—to save men from going down to destruction.

"There is a line by us unseen,
That crosses every human path;
The hidden boundary between,
God's patience and his wrath."

"Because I have called and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded: but ye have set at naught all my counsel; and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh in the day of your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as a storm, and your calamity cometh on as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish come upon you. Then shall they call upon me but I will not answer; they shall seek me diligently, but they shall not find me."

OBJECTION CONSIDERED.

But it will be objected to the view of the divine sovereignty here presented that we must ascribe to God entire freedom to purpose, or not to purpose, to provide salvation for our race, his decision in either case being absolutely right and perfect.

"In the case of man," says Dr. Candlish, (Atonement, 182,183), "had there been no remedy provided, we must believe that the whole progeny of Adam, whom, in his probation, he represented, would still have been brought into being. They were not in existence when he, as their head and representative, was tried and fell. They must have come into existence in successive generations after him. Is it not then a fair and probable presumption that all would have been suffered one after another, each individual for himself, to show what was in them? None would have been taken away in infancy. None would have passed from earth before opportunity had been given them to manifest, by their own wicked works, their practical acquiescence and complicity in the rebellion of their first father. Under such an arrangement the reality and universality of imputed guilt and transmitted taint of his original apostasy, would have been proven to be inevitable." But we would inquire what warrant there is in reason or revelation for the view here presented, and which rigid Calvinism necessarily implies, that it was morally possible for God to purpose to create our first parents, to permit the fall and the development of the successive generations of their posterity, and to make no provision for their salvation. The hypothesis is to our mind an impossible one, and the discussion of it as empty and vain as it would be to seek to determine what degree of swiftness would enable the greyhound to outrun his shadow. As we have said above, all that is known, all that there is any warrant for affirming, is that the plan of the universe which God adopted because most worthy of himself, included, as eternal and essential elements, the creation of man, the permission or non-prevention of the fall, and redemption through Jesus Christ. That the plan would have been equally perfect, or that it would have been worthy of comparison with the existing plan, the element of redemption being left out—is what no man knows or can know, and what therefore no man has a right to affirm.

This position does not imply that as regards the rights and claims of men God was under obligation to provide salvation, but only that the present plan, embracing the certainty of the fall and the purpose of redemption, is the most congruous with his nature, expressing most perfectly his infinite perfections. The confusion, common at this point, comes from conceiving the divine decrees as sustaining to each other relations of logical priority and posteriority. But the decrees, so called, are simply one decree, viz.: that one, indivisible, eternal act of will by which God determined to give reality to the existing plan of creation; one purpose involving an infinite number of executive acts in time and space, which *executive acts,* not *purposes,* stand to each other in both logical and chronological relations. Logically and chronologically the creation of Adam must precede his trial, and his trial must precede his fall, and his fall must precede his redemption as a fact. But the acts of God in this affair are a part of the infinity of executive acts by which he carries out his one, eternal purpose to so constitute and govern the universe that all things would take place precisely as they do take place. But to speak of the decree to create as prior, in the logical order, to the decree to permit the fall, and the decree to permit the fall, as prior to the decree to provide redemption, implies a total and confusing misconception.

NOT A SPECULATION.

If it is said that this is theological speculation, that all who essay the transcendental heights of this region are sure to be stricken with intellectual vertigo, etc., we reply by denying that it is a theological speculation that God is a being of absolute perfection, that he cannot deny himself, or that, since benevolence is an essential perfection of his nature, he will infallibly glorify it—must needs glorify it—in the salvation of mankind, so far as he can do so, without prejudice to any other principle of his being more fundamental than benevolence itself. We add in conclusion that though no man is required, or may presume to be able, "to justify the ways of God" in relation to our world, it may be proper for one to reject, and to attempt to justify himself in rejecting, some of the ways ascribed to God under the supposed exigencies of logic. Infinitely more reasonable would it be to deny the application to the mind of God of the fundamental laws of logic—to hold that he can choose a part of the members of a class without "passing by" the rest, than to attribute to him ways of action self-evidently inconsistent with his supreme ethical perfections.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE JOHANNEAN QUESTION.

BY PROFESSOR W. SANDAY, D.D.

From *The Expositor* (London), November, 1891.

I. THE TENDENCY OF RECENT CRITICISM.[*]

I HAD for some time had it in mind to attempt a survey of the present position of the Johannean question, taking as a text what I conceive to be the most conspicuous phenomenon of recent times in respect to it—the mutual *rapprochement* of the two great schools of opinion on the subject—when I found that the task had been already done for me. The same attempt had been already made by one who possesses special qualifications for the purpose. Among German theologians, Dr. Schürer, for some time past of Giessen, but recently transferred to Kiel, holds an eminent place for the combination of solid learning with evenly balanced judgment. He distinctly belongs to the party which would be commonly called "critical;" and yet I do not know any writer who would command at the same time an equal degree of confidence on the side opposed to his own. From such a hand a review of the Johannean question is peculiarly welcome; and it is this which Dr. Schürer offers in a lecture delivered in 1889 before a clerical conference at Giessen.[*] But what especially caught my own attention in this was that it took its start from the same point which I had set before myself—the gradual convergence of the two wings of the critical advance, and the possibility of obtaining an understanding between them.

Schürer begins his address by mapping out the history of the criticism of the Fourth Gospel into three broadly marked periods. The first is headed by Bretschneider's *Probabilia,* published in 1820, which really, if not exactly in name, heads the list of works in which the authorship of the Gospel has been disputed, and which is rightly credited by Weiss[†] with anticipating all the main lines of later destructive criticism. At a subsequent date, and in fact on three distinct occasions, Bretschneider deliberately withdrew his contentions, and expressed himself convinced by the replies which they called forth.[‡] To the same result contributed in a still higher degree the impressive personality of Schleiermacher, who came forward as a vehement champion of the genuineness of the Gospel. The decisive point with Schleiermacher was the

---

[*] The series of papers of which this is the first is planned to fall under the following heads: (1) "The Tendency of Recent Criticism;" (2) "External Evidence;" (3) "Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics;" (4) and (5) "The Author;" (6) "Partition and Derivation Theories." [NOTE.—By request we shall publish the full series.—Ed. MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.]

[*] *Ueber den gegenwärtiger Stand der Johanneischen Frage,* published in *Vorträge d. theol. Conferenz zu Giessen,* 1889. Since this was written an English version of Dr. Schürer's paper, with some additions and alterations, has appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for September. A reply by the present writer was inserted in the next number.

[†] *Einleitung,* p. 611 f.

[‡] For a full and clear account of Bretschneider's work, and of its place in his life, and bearing upon his general theological position, see Watkins, *Bampton Lectures* (1890), pp. 179–190.

"Totaleindruck"—the impression of the Gospel as a whole—"the impossibility of inventing a picture such as that there given of Christ." * The difference between St. John and the Synoptics was parallel to that between the twofold presentation of Socrates by Plato and Xenophon : St. John had as much the deeper insight as Plato. For two decades, or rather more, these arguments held the field. Even the cautious and critical Credner gave a full adhesion to them.

The next period opens with an influence as great as that of Schleiermacher. Ferdinand Christian Baur first expressed his views on the Fourth Gospel in the *Theologische Jahrbücher* for 1844. His effort here, as elsewhere, was to realize vividly the leading ideas of the Gospel, and place them in what seemed to be their historical surroundings. In the first part of this attempt he doubtless succeeded better than in the second. Baur's conception of the Gospel as an embodiment of the conflict between light and darkness caused by the incarnation of the Logos was at least far nearer the mark than the impossible date (160–170 A.D.) which he assigned to the Gospel. Within his own school the influence of Baur reigned supreme ; but without it, the effect of these radical views was only to excite a more energetic opposition. What we see in this period is the Tübingen School, concentrated and unanimous, on the one side, and a heterogeneous body of outside opinion over against it, on the other.

This state of things, again, lasted for rather more than twenty years. Schürer dates the beginning of his third period from the appearance of vol. i. of Keim's *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* in 1867. From that time to the present he thinks that the most conspicuous tendency had been that of which I have already spoken—the tendency towards a narrowing of the gap which separates the opposing forces from each other by mutual concessions.

Summarily these concessions are as follows. It is admitted that the external evidence carries back the composition of the Gospel some thirty or forty years beyond the date at which Baur had been inclined to place it. In other words, that at the very latest it must have been in existence in 130 A.D. ; it is admitted, further, that the Gospel is not in any case a purely ideal composition, but that it embodies a greater or less amount of genuine and authentic tradition ; and, lastly, it is admitted that the divergence between the Synoptic Gospels and St. John is not as wide as had been supposed.

On the affirmative side there are many, and it may be said an increasing number, who are prepared to allow that, even assuming the author of the Gospel to be St. John, still there is in the Gospel a certain subjective element ; that in particular the discourses in the Gospel are not reproduced exactly as they were spoken, but with such unconscious moulding in form, if not in substance, as they could not well escape after lying for some fifty or sixty years in the Apostle's mind.

I follow Schürer's estimates of the concessions that are made in the critical camp, so as to guard against overstatement, though I think that we shall be able to put rather more emphasis upon some of them. At the same time, there are of course on both sides writers who cannot be exactly embraced under the definition given. A special word should be said on some of these.

The most irregular combatants in the critical army are Thoma and Jacobsen. Thoma has devoted to his subject a large volume of nearly 900 pages, entitled *Die Genesis des Johannes-Evangeliums* (Berlin, 1882). In this he goes through the Gospel chapter by chapter, and reduces the whole —not merely a salient point here or there —to elaborate and systematic allegory. The Gospel is with him from first to last the fictitious clothing of an idea or group of ideas. "All the narratives are allegory, all the persons are types, all the discourses are dogma, all the notes of time and place, all the names and numbers, are taken symbolically." With the result that, as Weiss puts it, "the most spiritual of the Gospels becomes a second-hand and artificial mosaic, which would do no dishonour to the perverse ingenuity of a Talmudist or to the fantastic imagination of an Alexandrian." * Two brief specimens will, I think, be enough to give an idea of what this work is like. The question of the disciples in St. John i. 38, ποῦ μένεις ; "Where abidest Thou ?" is suggested by the passionate words of the lover in the Song of Songs (i. 7) : "Tell me, O thou whom my soul lovest, where thou feedest, where thou makest thy flock to rest at noon." The double hearing before Annas and Caiaphas is introduced because the false prophet in the Apocalypse, the counterpart of the true Lamb, the true High Priest, has two horns † (Rev. xiii. 11) ! Schürer himself dismisses this book as "a perfect model of fantastic caprice;"[*] neither has it met with much more favour elsewhere, though we shall see that it contains some good points, forcibly and clearly stated.[†] A similar view to Thoma's seems to be taken by Hönig.

---

* Schürer, *Vortrag*, p. 44, *Contemporary Review*, p. 390 ; cf. Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 303.

* *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1882, col. 221.

† *Die Genesis*, etc., pp. 407, 670.

Still less can we recognise the "spiritual Gospel" in Jacobsen's *Untersuchungen über das Johannes-Evangelium* (Berlin, 1884), a rude[‡] attempt to explain the Fourth Gospel as constructed out of materials supplied by the Synoptic Gospels, especially St. Luke, with some further help from St. Paul. It is not without its significance for the scientific value of their inquiries that both Thoma and Jacobsen[§]—strange to say, in the company of so really learned a scholar as Hilgenfeld[‖]—defend the genuineness of the adulteress section (St. John vii. 53–viii. 11) as a part of the original Gospel.

Besides these, though in a different sense, we must also put in a place by himself an English writer, Rev. John A. Cross, Vicar of St. John's, Little Holbeck, Leeds. I shall have occasion later to come back to some of Mr. Cross' arguments, but there is one peculiarity in his position which it seems right to notice here. He has published a succession of articles in different quarters—in the *Westminster Review* (August, 1890), the *Critical Review* (February, 1891), and the *Classical Review* (December, 1890, April and June, 1891), dealing with various points in the evidence relating to the Fourth Gospel. Yet, although the tendency of his arguments is uniformly negative, he nowhere says in so many words that he does not believe the Gospel to have been written by St. John. He rejects most of the current arguments, but, for all we know, he may have others in reserve which supply their place more effectually. Now with Mr. Cross' private opinion, as such, I am not concerned. He has every right to keep it to himself, if he wishes to do so. But I cannot help pointing out that criticism of this purely negative kind is not appropriate to a historical subject. It is the criticism of the law-courts, not of the historian. History consists in weighing and testing competing hypotheses, and deciding which fits best and with least forcing into the delicate framework of surrounding facts. But Mr. Cross gives us no alternative to consider. The very utmost that his arguments would amount to, supposing that they were more entirely valid than I think they are, would be that other hypotheses besides that of Johannean authorship were not excluded. When that was proved, we should still have to test those hypotheses in the same manner, and see that enough was not left in the old view to make it, after all deductions, preferable to the new. However I would not deny that the arguments in question have their use. They will at least prevent conventional and indolent acquiescence. And in the papers which follow, they may make it necessary for me to go over some ground which I should otherwise have felt free to pass by.

I hope, as I proceed, to do what I can at once to define more closely the extent of the concessions with which the two opposing parties are meeting each other, and to make a few remarks on the points which are still in controversy. But as a preliminary we may take a glance at the general drift and current of inquiry. This will appear better from looking broadly at the literature of the subject than from allowing ourselves to be entangled at once in the study of details.

It cannot fail to strike us how frequently, along with the freest criticism, even those writers who deny that St. John wrote the Gospel as we have it yet have recourse to the supposition that he had some direct or indirect connexion with it. It is this tendency which has gained so much in strength during the latest period of Johannean criticism. It has taken several forms. Some writers make, as it were, a vertical division in the contents of the Gospel; others, a horizontal. Some attempt to mark off a Gospel within the Gospel—certain portions which they regard as genuine and apostolic, while the rest is of the nature of later supplemental addition. Others would not venture upon drawing a definite line of this kind, but they would say that the recollections of an Apostle or eye-witness have passed through the hands of disciples, and that what we now have is not so much the recollections pure and simple, as the same recollections seen through a medium, coloured and modified by the action of another mind than that on which they were first impressed.

The first of these two kinds of partition-theory[*] had been tried by several writers in quick succession, some fifty years ago: first by Weisse, in 1838;[†] then by Schenkel, in

---

[*] Page 56; see also Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 116.

[†] Holtzmann in *Theol. Literaturbericht* (1885), p. 79.

[‡] Mangold speaks justly of his "hier und da recht herben Kritik" (*ap.* Bleek, *Einleitung*, fourth edition. Berlin, 1886, p. 291).

[§] *Untersuchungen*, p. 100.

[‖] *Die Evangelien* (Leipzig, 1854), p. 285.

---

[*] I believe that I owe the phrase to Archdeacon Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 246.

[†] In *Die Evangelische Geschichte Kritisch-philosophisch bearbeitet.* (Leipzig, 1838.)

1840;[*] lastly by Schweizer, in 1841.[†] All these attempts, it will be seen, fall in the first stage of the controversy, before Baur had entered into it. They have been revived quite recently, on lines not very dissimilar from those originally traced, in two rather notable instances. One is the elaborate work of Dr. H. H. Wendt, professor at Heidelberg, entitled *Die Lehre Jesu,* of which the first volume appeared in 1886 and the second last year. The other is the still more remarkable, if somewhat eccentric, series of works by Dr. Hugo Delff, *Die Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth* (Leipzig, 1889); *Das vierte Evangelium* (Husum, 1890); *Neue Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung d. vierten Evangeliums* (Husum, 1890). Into the more detailed views of these writers I hope to enter later. Both vindicate by far the greater part of the Gospel for an eye-witness, if not actually for the Apostle St. John.

Wendt adopted the traditional identification of the author with the Apostle. Dr. Delff in this, as in most other matters, takes a way of his own. He believes that the author bore the name of "John," but that he was the person afterwards known as "the presbyter," not the Apostle. It is not however as "presbyter" that Dr. Delff is most fond of describing him; the phrase which he more often uses is "the high priest John." This at once recalls the famous letter of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, about the year 190 A.D., an extract from which has been preserved by Eusebius,[‡] appealing amongst other authorities on the Paschal Controversy to John, "who lay on the bosom of the Lord, who acted as priest, wearing the plate of gold (ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς),[§] both witness and teacher." The "golden plate" is that worn by the high priest with the inscription HOLINESS TO THE LORD (Exod. xxviii. 36). Delff therefore argues that ἱερεύς is used broadly for "high priest," as even in the Mishnah.[‖] He infers that although the name "John" does not appear on the list of high priests, he belonged nevertheless to the high-priestly family, the γένος ἀρχιερατικόν of Acts iv. 6, Josephus *B. J.* iv. 3, 6, etc. He interprets πεφορεκώς as implying "not that the wearing of the plate was a constant attribute of his person or of his priestly dignity, but that he had worn it once in the past, and therefore that he once fulfilled the high-priestly functions in the dress of the high priest." He supports this by reference to the provision in the Talmud that if the high priest was prevented from acting on the Day of Atonement, a substitute might act for him. Delff thinks that John, who wrote the Gospel, had once acted in that capacity. In that case, the idea of his having *once* so acted would be contained not, as Delff seems to think, in πεφορεκώς, but rather in the aorist ἐγενήθη. Still it may be noticed as perhaps a slight argument against the common view that it was at Ephesus that John took to wearing the high priest's plate, that the term is πεφορεκώς and not φορῶν. Delff is quite right in pointing out that Polycrates, who was himself bishop of Ephesus, and an old man of at least sixty-five when he wrote, as well as counting seven bishops among his relatives, represents an exceptionally good and broadly based tradition. The passage is at once important and enigmatic, but I incline to think that some literal fact lies behind it, and that it is not merely a high-flown metaphor, as Bishop Lightfoot preferred to suppose.[*] It is an element in the question that Epiphanius ascribes the wearing of the πέταλον also to James the brother of the Lord—perhaps on the authority of Hegesippus, from whom other statements on the immediate context seem to be taken.[†] This would not be quite such good evidence as that of Polycrates, but there is the further possibility that Epiphanius may have transferred the statement from St. John to St. James by a slip of memory.[‡]

It was certainly an ingenious idea of Delff's to claim for the author of the Gospel this connexion with the high-priestly family, because it would at once explain not only the allusion to high placed personages like Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa, but also the accounts of secret sittings of the Sanhedrin, like that at which it was decided to compass our Lord's death, and the statement that many of the chief rulers believed on Him, though they were afraid to confess it.[§] This however is gained at the cost of sacrificing the passages which relate to the Galilæan ministry as interpolations. And it is a question whether the simple statement of St. John xviii. 15, "that disciple was known (γνωστός) to the high priest," does not sufficiently satisfy the facts on the traditional view.[*] It satisfies at least the data of the Gospel, which does seem to imply that the author had some private source of information in these higher circles. It would be enough that he should be in contact with them; he need not have mixed among them on terms of actual equality.

---

[*] In an article in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken.*

[†] In *Das Ev. Johannis, etc., kritisch untersucht.* (Leipzig, 1841.)

[‡] *H. E.* v. 24, iii. 31.

[§] So most MSS. of Eusebius, here and in iii. 31, for πεφορηκώς.

[‖] *Das vierte Evangelium*, p. 9.

[*] *Galatians*, p. 345, ed. 2; cf. *Philippians*, p. 252, ed. 1.

[†] Compare Epiph., *Hær.* lxxviii. 14, with Eus., *H. E.* ii. 23.

[‡] Cf. Lipsius, *Apokr. Apostelgesch.* ii. 2, 246. It would be rather in favour of Epiphanius' statement as at least in keeping with that of Hegesippus, preserved in Eusebius, that Hegesippus makes St. James enter the holy place. There is however in any case a legendary element in this narrative.

[§] St. John xi. 47–53, xii. 42, 43; cf. vii. 45–52.

The two writers whom I have mentioned, Wendt and Delff, both venture upon a definite excision of certain parts of the Gospel as not directly proceeding either from the Apostle or the presbyter. I hope to discuss their theories on this head at the close of these papers. But in assigning the main body of the Gospel to John, whether Apostle or presbyter, they naturally do not exclude a certain amount of redaction by the final editor. It is a more common view in the critical school to ascribe the whole of the Gospel to such an editor, but to believe that he embodied in it an authentic—and many would add Johannean—tradition.

Of course there are many different shades in this admission. Ewald regards the Gospel as dictated by the Apostle to the willing scribes by whom he was surounded. He finds in the style traces of this mode of composition. The opinion which he expresses on this head is interesting. "The sentences are short, but not seldom improved, repeated, supplemented, only at times more complicated in structure: this is just the manner of one who dictates words, sentences, and thoughts to an amanuensis, very different from the way in which Paul sketched out his thoughts in writing, and then left them for a skilful scribe to write out in a fair copy."[†] According to Ewald, the whole Gospel practically belongs to the Apostle. The scribes only put themselves forward in verses like St. John xix. 35, xxi. 24 f.

Reuss, in his fourth edition (to which alone I have access), speaks with much reserve on the subject of authorship, which he would seem to throw into—but not far into—the second century, but at the same time he allows that "a number of incidental details, notes of time and place, unimportant in themselves, of personal relations and particular circumstances of all kinds, may without forcing be referred to the statement or authority of an eye-witness;" and even the discourses, which are questioned in the form in which they stand, are yet said to be "drawn from the purest sources, and to have their roots in the best soil"[*] (*gesundestem Boden*).

Renan, in his latest phase, after having at one time thought that the Gospel was written by a disciple of St. John during his lifetime, still refers it directly to his school, and sees in it in great part a reflection of the personal teaching of the Apostle.[†]

Weizsäcker, in his *Apostolisches Zeitalter*, works up with great skill a picture of the school of St. John at Ephesus, which has for its twofold product at once the Apocalypse and the Gospel.

Even Holtzmann, in both editions of his *Einleitung*, admits that, with all its supernaturalism, the Gospel has not a little to show of the "hard, intractable facts of history."[‡] In like manner in his brief *Handcommentar* he has recourse "to personal recollections, whether of the Apostle himself, under whose flag the work seeks to pass itself, or of his disciples, or of other witnesses whom the author had met in Palestine."[§]

Schürer appears to adopt in his own person a view very similar to that of Weizsäcker. He summarizes that writer's opinion to the effect that the Gospel "everywhere rests upon a real tradition, but that this tradition has been handled with great freedom and persistently idealized."[‖] He adds that the leading ideas of Weizsäcker seem to him to point out the way on which the sharply divided forces of the assailants and defenders of the genuineness of the Gospel may one day join hands. In full accord with this are some weighty words which occur in the course of a review of a work on the Fourth Gospel by Oscar Holtzmann. Oscar Holtzmann, a younger cousin —not brother[¶]—of the well-known Strassburg professor last mentioned, while allowing some traces of sound tradition in the Gospel, is inclined to reduce them to a minimum. On this Schürer remarks: "I confess that just these careful investigations of the author have strengthened me in the conviction that the contents of the Gospel cannot be understood merely as a free production on the basis of Synoptic materials, but that a separate tradition finds utterance (*durchklingt*) in it, although handled with supreme freedom."*

---

[*] It has often been pointed out that the fact that Zebedee, the father of John, had "hired servants" (Mark i. 20), shows him to have been a man of some substance.

[†] *Die Johanneischen Schriften* (Göttingen, 1861), p. 50. The examples referred to are St. John iii. 22-24, iv. 1-3, 43-45.

[*] *Gesch. d. heil. Schrift. N. T.*, §§ 218, 220.

[†] *Les Évangiles* (1877), p. 228 ff.

[‡] Ed. 1, p. 431; ed. 2, p. 457.

[§] Page 18.

[‖] *Vortrag*, p. 57.

[¶] As Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 262. The relationship is explained by the younger writer himself in the preface to his book (*Das Johannes-Evangelium*, Darmstadt, 1837, p. iv.). Heinrich Holtzmann has a brother whose name is "Otto" (*Einleitung*, p. viii.).

The extent of this freedom is a point on which I hope to join issue with Dr. Schürer later. For the present I am not concerned with controversy, but am simply adducing evidence to show how far the two sides have gone along the road to meet each other. It is now my duty to show how the gradual approximation is not confined to the critical camp, but has its place in the conservative ranks as well.

The subject on which the greatest concessions have been made by conservative writers is the *discourses.* It is coming to be allowed, even by those who uphold the genuineness of the Gospel, that these have undergone some greater or less modification in the mind of the Apostle before they came to be set down in writing.

Perhaps I may be permitted to begin by quoting some words of my own, written now some twenty years ago. They are the words of one who was only a beginner in theological or critical studies, but who was at least trying his best to look at the facts before him freshly and truthfully. It was urged at the outset that there were two questions which ought to be kept separate: the question whether the discourses in the Fourth Gospel represent accurately the words spoken by our Lord, and the further question, whether they are such as to have been committed to writing by an Apostle. The objections were stated thus:

> "It is well known that the style and subjects of the Johannean discourses have from the first supplied one of the gravest arguments against the Gospel. It is urged against them doubly, that they are unlike the discourses contained in the Synoptic Gospels, which, on the other hand, correspond exactly to the description given of our Lord's discourses by tradition; and that while they differ from the discourses in the Synoptists, they present a close and suspicious similarity, both in style and matter, to the Epistle which goes under the name of St. John and was certainly written by the author of the Gospel."

To this it was replied by granting that both the difference and the likeness do exist, though both might be exaggerated on the question of degree. It was admitted that the discourses in the Synoptic Gospels agreed better with the description of our Lord's sayings by Justin Martyr than those in St. John; that among the latter were none which could be called in the strict sense "parables;" that the action was stationary, and not moving or dramatized; and that the thing figured was not cut loose from the figure. Further, that the discourses in St. John were as a rule longer, and not progressive or self-evolving, as with the Synoptists, but frequently returning to the same point, appearing to revolve round a fixed centre, and that centre, not exclusively, but very largely, the Speaker Himself, His works, His person, faith in Him, that Divine Paraclete who was to take His place when He was gone.

What, it was asked, was to be said to these differences? If it was assumed, as it might be, that the Synoptic discourses accurately represent the original, was it probable that the Johannean discourses were equally authentic? Could two such different types at one and the same time be true? To a certain extent they could. Dr. Westcott, for instance, argued that the difference of style corresponded to a difference in locality; that it was one thing to address the simple, impressible peasants of Galilee, and another thing to meet the subtle and learned doctors of the law at Jerusalem; that there were traces in the Synoptists of the same exalted claims and self-assertion; and that it was only natural that the disciple "whom Jesus loved" should consciously or unconsciously mould his own utterances into the likeness of his Master's.

Every one, it was admitted, would feel that there was truth in these observations, and that they would carry us a certain way. But when it was asked if they would carry the whole way and cover the whole of the phenomena, it was thought that an absolute, impartial judge would say No. All the discourses in St. John were not placed in Judæa, neither were all those in the Synoptics placed in Galilee. The Johannean discourses were not all addressed to doctors of the law, and those in the Synoptists were not addressed exclusively to the populace; indeed the audiences did not seem to vary so very greatly. And the resemblance to the style of the Epistles extended to the discourses of the Baptist as well as to those of our Lord.

It seemed to follow from all this, that the discourses had undergone some sensible modification; and the only question was whether that modification was so great that they could not have been set down as we have them by an eye-witness and Apostle. This question was answered in the negative. It was thought that there was no greater modification than "might naturally result from a strong intellect and personality operating unconsciously upon the facts stored up in the memory, and gradually giving to them a different form, though without altering their essential nature and substance." A Gospel, in short, written by St. John need not have been expected to differ in character very much from such a Gospel as we should have had, if one had been written, from the hands of St. Paul.*

---

* *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, col. 330.

All turned of course upon the range and extent of the alterations introduced into the discourses. We shall have to attempt to gauge this at a later stage. For the present we will only note the admissions of conservative critics. These, as we might suppose, differ considerably in degree. The reference made above to Dr. Westcott was to the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels;* † but I doubt if the elaborate and masterly *Prolegomena* in the *Speaker's Commentary* go, in set terms at least, much farther. It is admitted that we are "brought in the later record to a new aspect of the person and work of Christ, to a new phase of Christian thought, to a new era in the history of the Christian Church:" ‡ but, as well as I can gather, the facts are supposed to have been already there, although previously unapprehended; there is no express allowance for colouring imparted by the mind of the Apostle.

Next to Dr. Westcott's among English commentaries in fulness and thoroughness is the treatment of the Gospel by Dr. H. R. Reynolds in the *Pulpit Commentary.* Dr. Reynolds writes thus:

> "A subjective element cannot be denied so far as the choice of subject-matter is concerned, and even the order, the symmetry, the dramatic grandeur, and monotony of Divine substratum and ethical appeal; but it appears to me infinitely impossible that the subjectivity went so far as to create the form and substance of St. John's Gospel."

It is allowed as "conceivable that the author in the longer discourses may have introduced germane thoughts and words which belonged to different occasions," and that he "may moreover have selected those more notable and impressive teachings which justified and created in his own mind the sublime theodicy of the prologue;" but it is not allowed that he can have invented them.§

In like manner, Dr. Gloag, in his recent *Introduction to the Johannine Writings,*‖ has "no hesitation in allowing a certain degree of subjectivity on the part of John. The thoughts and sentiments were those of Jesus, but John clothed them in his own language, and in some cases subjoins to those discourses of Jesus his own reflections. Probably, also, he unites into one discourse utterances of Jesus spoken at different times."

Dr. Plummer, in the *Cambridge Greek Testament,** gives an interesting extract from a letter of Cardinal Newman's, in which attention is called to the fact that the ancients did not use the third person for the indirect and paraphrastic narration so much as we do. Hence though the first person may be used, the style and words may be those of the reporter, and not of the speaker. I will close this *catena* of English writers with a striking passage from the *Bampton Lectures* † of Archdeacon Watkins:

> "The key to the Fourth Gospel lies in translation, or, if this term has acquired too narrow a meaning, transmutation, re-formation, growth; nor need we shrink from the true sense of the terms development and evolution. I mean translation in language, from Aramaic into Greek; translation in time extending over more than half a century, the writer passing from manhood to mature old age; translation in place, from Palestine to Ephesus; translation in outward modes of thought, from the simplicity of Jewish fishermen and peasants, or the ritual of Pharisees and priests, to the technicalities of a people who had formed for a century the meeting ground, and in part the union, of the philosophies of East and West."

Time will compel me to restrict the like *catena* which it would be easy to make from Continental writers.

Godet allows for transference from Aramaic to Greek; he allows for compression; and he allows for the action of memory. The discourses of the Fourth Gospel are therefore with him, not so much a photograph as an extracted essence. But he will not admit that "the slightest foreign element" has been introduced.‡

Luthardt goes a step beyond Godet. He takes up a saying of Keim's, and admits that the Gospel is "to a high degree subjective," but asserts that it is a misuse of language to treat this as equivalent to "historically arbitrary."

> "When Hilgenfeld thinks that the historical is sunk in the doctrinal, we can readily own it, rightly understood. What they call doctrinal is just the soul of the history, which shines out everywhere from the body of the history. It is true that this is not possible without a certain freedom in the handling of the historical materials, and, indeed, a greater freedom than we permit to ourselves and to others. But in antiquity in general, and on biblical ground in particular, they stood towards the historical material in a manner different from ours." §

---

* *Authenticity and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel* (London, 1882), pp. 69–74.

† Pages 263–265, 267 (ed. 3, 1867). ‡ Page lxxvii.

§ *The Gospel of St. John*, vol. i., p. cxxvii. (third edition, 1888).

‖ Page 146 f.

* Page 100. † Page 426 f.

‡ *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, i. 135 (Eng. trans. 1876).

§ *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel* (Eng. trans. 1875), p. 247 f.

Stronger even than this is the language used by Weiss and Beyschlag, not without a protest from Nösgen.* Weiss insists upon the free reproduction of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, showing at once the style and doctrinal character of the Johannean Epistles. Not only the original text, he says, but the concrete historical relations of the words of Jesus are often effaced, while the evangelist concentrates his attention on their permanent significance and value in connexion with his view of the person of Christ.† And Beyschlag no less emphatically endorses Weizsäcker's phrase about the "double countenance" (*Doppelantlitz, Doppelgesicht*) of the Fourth Gospel and the twofold impression which it makes, at once historical and unhistorical.‡ Similarly Paul Ewald, another strong champion of the genuineness of the Gospel, nevertheless recognises its subjective character and the dominance of the idea.§

I do not of course wish to be answerable for all the expressions which have been quoted. As we go on, considerations will come into view which put a limit to the degree of subjectivity which can be admitted. I have only given a number of varied opinions, in order to bring out the common tendency which runs through them.

On both sides I have spoken of "concessions." We are apt to call any step which is made by one party towards another by that name. Yet it is really false and misleading. The differences of opinion with which we are concerned are not matters of negotiation, conducted on the principle of "give and take." Both sides, we may assume, are actuated by the same love and search for truth, and the determination to be satisfied with nothing less. But an open mind will listen to the arguments which are brought against as well as for its own conclusions. It is called upon for a decision, and it gives it to the best of its ability at the time. Still the dart *hæret lateri*. The impression sinks deeper and deeper. A certain unconscious shifting and adaptation takes place. And the next time the old decision is given it is in rather less confident tones, or not without substantial modification. So opponents gradually approach nearer to each other; and so they may be expected to approach. For truth is no monopoly, but is arrived at slowly and surely by the long co-operation, and the friction which is also co-operation, of many minds.

---

* *Gesch. d. neutest. Offenbanung*, i. 63.

† *Einleitung*, p. 607; *Leben Jesu*, i. 133, etc.

‡ *Leben Jesu*, p. 125.

§ *Hauptproblem*, etc., p. 5.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. With an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic. Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson. Edited with constant reference to the *Thesaurus* of Gesenius as completed by E. Rödiger, and with authorized use of the latest German editions of Gesenius' *Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, by Francis Brown, D.D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, with the co-operation of S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Charles A. Briggs, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Part I., 1891, Lexicon 8vo, pp. xii., 80. (א-אשר.)

Robinson's Gesenius, which has been for fifty years the standard Hebrew-English Lexicon, at least on this side of the Atlantic, was in the first edition (1836) nothing more than a translation of Gesenius's *Lexicon manuale*, etc., 1834. In the second edition (1843) it was revised, in part after the author's copy for a new edition of the *Lexicon manuale*, in part, after the death of Gesenius (October 23d, 1842), in accordance with the author's latest opinion as expressed in his larger lexicon, the *Thesaurus* (Fasc. iii., 1839; iv., 1840; v., 1842). This part of Robinson's Lexicon, in its final form, is therefore "a condensed copy" of the *Thesaurus*. The Lexicon was stereotyped up to the point which the *Thesaurus* had then reached (p. 1032). In 1854, the last part of the *Thesaurus* having been completed by Rödiger (1853), Robinson revised the last two letters of the alphabet on the same plan. The edition of 1854 (so-called 5th edition; two title editions having been put on the market in 1849 and 1850) is, therefore, the final edition of Robinson's Gesenius. The half century which has intervened has not witnessed any such signal—I might almost say creative—achievements in Hebrew lexicography as those of which Gesenius's own works are the lasting monuments; but great progress has been made in Semitic philology, in geographical and archæological research, and in the criticism and interpretation of the Old Testament text. In Germany the successive revisions of Gesenius's *Handwörterbuch* have followed this advance after a fashion, though they have by no means kept pace with it; but in this country and in England nothing of any note has been done in this direction.

It was evident to the editors of the present work at the outset that a mere revision of Robinson's Gesenius would be entirely inadequate; nor, in view of the general dissatisfaction with which scholars regarded the latest (8th to 11th) editions of the *Handwörterbuch* by Mühlau and Volck, could a translation or revision of that work meet the reasonable demands of modern learning. They became convinced "that their first and perhaps chief duty was to make a fresh and, as far as possible, exhaustive study of the Old Testament materials, determine the actual uses of words by detailed examination of every passage, comparing, at the same time, their employment in the related languages, and thus fix their proper meanings in Hebrew." While the labors of their predecessors have been freely used, they have therefore really made a new dictionary. In the division of labor among the editors, Professor Driver has contributed the articles on the pronouns and particles; Professor Briggs, those on terms important to Old Testament Religion, Theology, and Psychology; while Professor Brown has undertaken the rest of the work and the editorial charge of the whole.

It is the unfortunate thing about a reviewer's task that in pointing out the features of a work which seem to him to admit of improvement—which I have done with the more freedom in this instance, because the printing of the Lexicon has only fairly begun—he but too easily conveys to the reader an impression less favorable than his own judgment of the whole. Let me, then, say at the outset that the Lexicon seems to me to be altogether in advance of any previous work of the kind, and to promise to be a credit and a gain to American and English scholarship. It is to be hoped that it may be carried to completion without further interruption.

In the disposition of the material, the etymological order of the *Thesaurus* has been adopted instead of the alphabetical order of Robinson and the *Handwörterbuch;* but the difficulties which this arrangement occasions to the beginner are at least diminished by inserting in their alphabetical place words whose etymological affinities he would be likely to mistake, with a reference to the root under which they are treated. The Aramaic of parts of Ezra and Daniel is properly reserved for an appendix. Following the good example of the later editions of the German Gesenius, under every word the forms which occur in the Old Testament are registered with illustrative references.

What the editors in their prefatory note recognize as their chief task, the re-examination of the whole usage as a means of determining the signification of each Hebrew word and the genetic relation of its various senses, has manifestly been done with great pains. By employing a condensed mode of citation it has been made possible to give a much greater number of references than are to be found in previous lexicons. Of all the rarer words, and of many which can hardly be included in this class, all the occurrences are cited: and, as such articles are distinguished by an obelus, the Lexicon may so far take the place of a concordance. The discrimination of the various senses and uses of words is worked out with great minuteness. It may be a fair question whether the subdivision is not in some cases carried to a point where it obstructs a rapid and comprehensive survey of the usage; especially where the subdivisions correspond to peculiarities of our own idiom, which compel us to render by different English words, rather than to any real difference of meaning or use in Hebrew; but this fault, if it be one, the Lexicon shares with many other good dictionaries. The orderly and lucid arrangement of a dictionary article, so that the logic of speech shall be clearly manifest in it when it is read continuously, while, on the other hand, any division of it may be conveniently and quickly consulted, is the task which makes the greatest demands on the higher powers of the lexicographer. Upon his ability to digest and organize his materials it depends whether his work shall be a chaotic mass, the more confusing the more there is of it, or an orderly creation. In general the Lexicon seems to me to have achieved a reasonable success in this respect, though I must confess that there are a number of articles in which the principle of disposition is not clear to me. Why, for example, to take the first instance which falls under my eye, should the senses of *'abad* be given in the order: 1, *perish, die;* 2, fig. *perish, vanish;* 3, *be lost, strayed* (similarly Gesenius, *Thesaurus*)? Is not the primary meaning seen in 3 (cf. also Arab. *'abada*, which is not mentioned), from which the natural development is, *stray, be lost* (animals, men); *perish* (extended also to things, and in figurative uses)? Or why, in the article *'elōhīm*, should the (extremely doubtful) meaning *rulers, judges* be given the first place? Surely this is neither the primary nor the prevailing sense of the word; if, in consideration of the history of exegesis, it is to be noticed at all, it belongs at the other end of the article.

The definitions are for the most part clear and exact, and are abundantly illustrated by examples. A valuable feature of the Lexicon, for which all who use it will be grateful, is the introduction, with a completeness which has not hitherto been attempted, of the synonyms and contrasted words which occur in the parallelism of Hebrew poetry and higher prose. In the case of words whose etymology or meaning is disputed, references are given to the authors and works where fuller discussion may be found, so that the Lexicon serves as an index to the recent literature. It may be presumed that few if any besides Hebrew scholars by profession will make much use of this apparatus; but by means of an elaborate scheme of abbreviations it is kept within narrow limits of space, and the uninitiated need not be unduly alarmed at the algebraic appearance of the formulas.

It has been the not undeserved reproach of Hebrew Lexicons that they have ignored the criticism of the text, and spent much time and ingenuity in giving account of words which owe their existence solely to copyist's blunders. This criticism cannot be made upon the work before us. Where the reading is dubious, the editors have indicated their doubt; where a probable emendation has been proposed they have frequently noted it; but they have wisely avoided the opposite extreme, which would make the Lexicon a catch-all for conjectures. The critical analysis of the Hexateuch is recognized in the citations from it, and the usage of JE, D, and P, where a difference exists, is discriminated. That these symbols are obnoxious to some who will use the Lexicon, I can well believe; but in a work which essays to represent the actual state of Old Testament learning, the authors would not have been justified in ignoring the analysis, even if they did not themselves accept it. It can only be demanded that a wise reserve be exercised, and that the examples adduced be from those parts of the sources named about which there is general agreement among those who accept the analysis. Reflection on the appalling durability of electrotype plates, if nothing else, should be a sufficient warning against perpetuating eccentricities of individual conjecture or passing phases of opinion.

A great deal of labor has evidently been spent upon the etymologies. The material has accumulated rapidly in the last few years through the discovery and publication of inscriptions; the recovery of the Assyrian; the great advances in the lexicography of the other Semitic languages (Arabic, Syriac, Aramaic and Middle Hebrew), to which must be reckoned the publication of native lexica and other philological works. To bring this material together and apply it with a rigidly scientific method to Hebrew etymology is a task which no one has as yet undertaken in a systematic way;

and which, indeed, would to-day be premature. Whenever it is taken in hand, it must be by an association of trained philologists who are thoroughly at home in the various languages and literatures included in the comparison. The etymologies in the new Lexicon are not to be judged by such a standard, but by what is to-day practicable for the lexicographer. From this point of view it is to be said at the outset that in sobriety and general reasonableness the Lexicon compares very advantageously with the recent German editions of Gesenius; but there is room for considerable improvement in the accuracy with which the forms and meanings of the words adduced for comparison from other Semitic languages are cited. I have observed this particularly in the Arabic, where the wealth of the vocabulary and the very various literal and tropical senses of many words make the utmost caution necessary. In the case of words which are not found in Lane's great but incomplete Lexicon, recourse to the native lexica, and especially to Lane's chief source, the *Taj el-'Arūs*, is indispensable. Freytag's awkward and often obscure Latin is always a dangerous reliance. It is but just to say that a considerable part of these inaccuracies go back to Gesenius himself, and have enjoyed the favor of Mühlau and Volck.

Professor Driver, than whom no one is better fitted for such a task, has given a fresh and thorough treatment of the pronouns, prepositions, and other particles, which takes us a long step forward in this division of lexicography. The articles on subjects connected with the religion of Israel have also received special attention. Some of these are treated with greater fulness and in a more descriptive manner than we are accustomed to in a dictionary; cf., *e.g.*, the articles *'ūrīm* and *'asham.* In the latter article it is remarkable that the two passages which illustrate the old popular usage, as distinct from the technical sense which it has in the laws (1 Sam. vi. 3; 2 Kings xii. 17), are only cited incidentally in the course of a remark that in the technical sense the word is unknown to J E D, etc. To speak of but one other class, the geographical articles are hardly up to the general standard of the Lexicon. This is difficult to account for, because these articles (by Mühlau) were almost the only part of the recent German editions of Gesenius which were of conspicuous merit. Better results would, I think, have been secured by a simple translation of Mühlau's work, with such additions as might be made necessary by more recent research. The references to the literature in this division of the Lexicon are singularly scanty, in comparison with other parts where they were at least not more necessary, and are sometimes misleading, as when Tristram's *Topography* is quoted for an identification suggested by Robinson. Finally, if I may express a personal opinion, too much attention is paid to the eccentricities and perversities of the English *Survey* in the matter of "identifications."

GEORGE F. MOORE.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE EPIC OF THE INNER LIFE. Being the Book of Job, translated anew, and accompanied with notes and an introductory study. By JOHN F. GENUNG. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891. 16mo, pp. xi., 352, $1.25.

This is pre-eminently an age of literary criticism as applied to the Bible. It is an age when the Bible is studied more rationally than ever before. There may have been times when the Scriptures have been read with a more devout spirit, and there certainly have been times when a bold rationalism in interpretation has gone to greater lengths; but never have the books of the Sacred Volume been interpreted more reasonably and sensibly than at the present time. Of all the books of the Bible, those constituting the so-called Chokhmah literature, the literature of Wisdom, have gained the most by the application of what may be called the rational or sensible method of interpretation. The Proverbs of Solomon and other sages; Ecclesiastes, with its picture of a life conflict, portraying the deepest struggles of a noble soul in its alternations of light and darkness, belief and scepticism, issuing in the one noble conclusion, "Fear God"; Job with its majestic view of a mighty spirit wrestling amid darkness and uncertainty with that most terrible of problems, the mysterious providence of God, and proving the reality of that wisdom which is the fear of Jahveh; the Song of Songs with its dramatic picture of a noble maiden's soul engaged in a momentous struggle with a subtle and terrible foe, but crowned at last with a glorious victory—all these are now better understood as to their poetic structure, their religious and philosophic meaning, and their ethical purpose than ever before; and we wonder that men ever perceived in them those strange allegorical fancies, and those prophetic and Messianic references which once formed the sole justification for their place in the canon.

The book which forms the subject of this notice is a most excellent illustration of the sensible and rational method of interpreting Scripture. Seldom have we chanced upon so refreshing and spirited a presentation of the meaning of the unknown poet, who has with so masterly a hand, albeit under divine inspiration, depicted the mighty soul of the man of Uz in the throes of its struggle with the deepest problem of human existence, whose solution is found in the *life*, not the words, of the hero of that poem. In this book there is no needless display of Oriental learning, no unintelligible theological nonsense, no defiant rationalism, no silly, would-be pious straining of passages to a Messianic reference. If ever an interpreter seemed to be fair and unprejudiced, the author of this book seems to be.

His work to be rightly estimated must be judged according to the task he has set before him at the outset. It is a revision and completion of an article in the *Andover Review* for November, 1888, with a new translation of the Hebrew text of the poem. It is an endeavor to present the book as a homogeneous whole. Having sought for what seemed to him the natural purpose of the book, judging it as possessing such a unity, he has translated the whole with reference to that purpose. It is not an attempt to reconstruct any supposed original form of the poem; the author takes it all as he finds it, seeking a purpose which justifies the presence of the discourses of Elihu. It is not an attempt to prove the historical character of the narrative, nor to attribute it to any known biblical writer. It is not a homiletical commentary, that most useless of useless things to a man with brains, nor does it pretend to be a critical commentary, although the critical student will read much between the lines of the author's notes. It is emphatically a book worth reading, stimulating and helpful, clearly a book by a student for students. The superficial reader will not appreciate it. The most critical will not lay it aside without reading it, though he may differ with the author as to the exact purpose of the poem, or in regard to matters of detail in the translation or elucidation of its text.

The author styles Job an "epic." This he explains in his preface is to be taken in a modified sense; but the use of this designation best conveys the author's idea of the purpose of the poem, which, though semi-dramatic in form and action, "centres in a hero whose spiritual achievements it makes known to us." The life of Job, as told in this poem, in the prose prologue and epilogue, and indirectly in the solemn rounds of dialogue, is, in its exhibition of the spiritual forces at work in it and in its conquests in integrity and faith, an answer to the question of the supernatural adversary, "Doth Job fear God for naught?" or, "Is there a fear of God apart from considerations of self-interest?" The history, which to the mind of the author answers this question, is expressed by him in the following sentence, which is the key-note of his interpretation of the whole book: "There is a service of God which is not work for reward; it is a heart-loyalty, a hunger after God's presence, which survives loss and chastisement, which in spite of contradictory seeming cleaves to what is godlike as the needle seeks the pole, and which reaches up out of the darkness and hardness of this life to the light and love beyond." But Job himself is utterly unaware of this answer as well as of the problem. In the dramatic arrangement of the poem both belong to the realm of the world above. Still the hero of the epic remains true to Jahveh, as he believes in Him and combats only that idea of God which a sordid humanity makes for itself. The life of Job is thus regarded, not as an answer to the mysterious question, "Why does suffering befall the righteous?" Nor is the theme of the book the mystery of God's providential government of men. But the life of Job is considered as a triumphant vindication of a genuine "fear of God," which remains unshaken even in the face of absolute proof, so far as human reason can see, of a contradiction in divine dealings with men. With this view there becomes at once manifest the skill of the author in revealing, as he does in his translation, the human littleness of the arguments of all three of the friends, as also of Elihu, and even of Job himself, in comparison with which shines in unspeakable grandeur the awful majesty of Job's fearless confidence and faith in Jahveh, and his thrilling defiance of the unknown—not of God, as men might reason, and as it seemed to Job himself when he paused to reason, but of the mysterious and baffling circumstances which were incapable of sweeping away his faith and his fear of God, though they sorely puzzled and paralyzed his reason.

In regard to the date and authorship of the Book of Job Professor Genung makes no strong special plea; but he thinks it was written in the time of Hezekiah by some unknown author. This he supports by the advanced social state recognized in the book, the Wisdom instruction of the book, the basis of which were the Proverbs of Solomon, a comparison of the language of Job with the prophets, and the fact that the book was evidently written in a time of great material prosperity.

Professor Genung's translation is natural and vivid, somewhat free as suited his purpose, but nowhere doing violence to the sense of the original.

William C. Daland.

Westerly, R. I.

Charles Grandison Finney. (American Religious Leaders Series.) By G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Oberlin Theological Seminary, Ohio. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891. 16mo, pp. vi., 329, $1.25.

Professor Wright possesses some very special qualifications for the task he has here attempted. In the first place he was a student in Oberlin for eight years during the height of President Finney's influence in the college and community there; and for a part of this time he was a pupil in President Finney's classes. In the second place, he holds substantially to the system of theology and moral philosophy taught by President Finney. In the third place, Professor Wright has had sufficient acquaintance with men and systems of theology in places outside of Oberlin to give him the proper perspective for the study he has undertaken.

Writing thus as a pupil and personal friend, in full sympathy with the characteristic features of President Finney's life and teachings, Professor Wright is able in an unusual degree to deal sympathetically with his subject, to clear away misconceptions, to satisfy the expectations of those who knew President Finney best and admired him most. The writer of this review entering on the study of theology at Oberlin in the same class with Professor Wright, and a little later associated with President Finney in the faculty of Oberlin College, finds his own impressions and judgments expressed in these pages, with scarcely an occasion for modification or change. At the same time, Professor Wright's familiarity with the history and theological discussions of the times of which he treats is such as to enable him to deal critically with his materials and to mark the limitations as well as the strong points in President Finney's system and influence, and thus to reach a far wider circle of readers.

President Finney, happily, left in manuscript his autobiography, written with inimitable simplicity and frankness, which since his death has been published in several editions, and has made the public well acquainted with the salient features of his life and labors. This work, from its very nature, deals with a limited field, and so far from precluding a sketch like the one before us, even requires it for the full and proportionate view of the man and his work in relation to his times. Professor Wright, while freely using the autobiography, has wisely chosen to follow a plan of his own in narrating the outlines of President Finney's life.

The story of President Finney's conversion and evangelistic labors possesses an intrinsic interest which can never fail. Even in the condensed form necessitated by the limits of this volume, it is fascinating and impressive. And yet, probably, the part of this work which will be read with liveliest interest is the chapter devoted to President Finney's theological system. Of course one does not find everything here; and disappointment is, perhaps, inevitable in such an epitome. Had it been possible, it would have been a welcome and a useful service if the place of the system in the history of doctrine during the last century had been more fully stated and traced out somewhat in detail. Materials would thus have been furnished for a judgment as to the value of the system and the permanency of its influence, such as is hardly justified by the contents of this volume.

Professor Wright has done full justice to President Finney's remarkable career as a revivalist, has clearly grasped and accurately defined the characteristic features of his theology, has corrected some misapprehensions, and has done a real service thereby, for which he deserves generous credit. The style of the volume is clear, dignified, and worthy of the subject. A single infelicity is noted; the subject of this sketch is spoken of as *Finney* from first to last.

President Finney was a great revivalist, a great preacher, an inspiring teacher, a great man. None admired him more than those who knew him best. The quality of genius belonged to all he said and did; he stood apart from men, even among those who were most intimate with him; as Wordsworth says of Milton:

> "Thy soul was like a star, and dwelt apart."

It was a tonic to mind and heart to know him, and study with him, and hear him preach; and the thousands of Oberlin students who for two score years came under the spell of his thought and life owe to him no small part of the best in mind and character which they won from their academic course. He was one of those rare men of whom it may justly be said that it was a liberal education to know him well. He had his limitations; it is easy to name them. But in spite of them all he was a man of rare intellectual and spiritual power, who moulded the religious thought and life of his times with the hand of a master. It is well that his true image, as this volume happily presents it, be kept fresh and vivid to the men of later generations. JUDSON SMITH.

BOSTON, MASS.

TWELVE SERMONS BY THE LATE EUGÈNE BERSIER, D.D., of l'Église de l'Étoile, Paris. Translated by MRS. ALEXANDER WAUGH. With Portrait. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891. Pp. 288, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

No pastor of the French Protestant churches, since the celebrated Adolphe Monod, has surpassed, none, perhaps, even approached Eugène Bersier as a pulpit orator His sudden death, on November 19th, 1889, was felt to be a great and almost an irretrievable loss to the cause of religion; for, to use the words of the venerable Dr. Jules Bonnet, writing immediately after the sad event, "the great ministry of Pastor Eugène Bersier remains one of the glories of the Church of Paris and of French Protestantism entire." We confess that we took up the present volume with much curiosity. Many years ago we first became acquainted with M. Bersier, then a young man of about sixteen years of age, who had come from his native town of Morges in Switzerland to enter into mercantile business in the city of New York. Shortly after he returned to Europe and began his theological studies. In a comparatively brief time we heard of him again as a most promising preacher, the brilliancy of whose sermons attracted marked attention and applause even in the French capital, and from audiences accustomed to the striking discourses of Grandpierre and Coquerel. When, after a period of preliminary practice in the obscure faubourg Saint Antoine, he made his appearance in the pulpit of the more critical Taitbout Chapel, the headquarters of the Free Church at Paris, he was already an adept in one of the most important but most difficult of arts—the art of sacred rhetoric. The wide range of his reading, the acuteness of his reasoning, and the beauty and fulness of his oratorical forms, it was observed, made of the young preacher a master whose claims to pre-eminence were indisputable. It was no slight tribute to his powers that an excellent judge of another religious creed, M. de Sacy, in referring to his sermons in an article published in the *Journal des Débats*, did not hesitate to style him "the equal, as a moralist, of the greatest men that have illustrated the old Catholic pulpit." Crowds flocked to hear him wherever it was announced that he was to speak. The "Église de l'Étoile," which may be said to have had its origin in his effective preaching, became one of the largest and certainly the most attractive churches of the capital. Eugène Bersier did not lose any of his popularity or of his influence when he came to see in the national Protestant Church the old church of the Huguenots, the true hope for the future of France, and transferred his relations to it from the Free Church, of which he had hitherto been one of the great lights. He carried with him the undiminished love and confidence of all his friends. Nor did he confine himself to strictly pastoral labors. In the advocacy of every great religious or moral movement he was conspicuous for his zeal and for his success. Among his writings that will enjoy the longest currency is a historical work on Admiral Coligny, which had its origin in his efforts to promote the scheme, now a realized fact, for the erection of a statue to that great Protestant patriot opposite the Louvre and near the spot where he was assassinated in 1572.

The portrait, a speaking likeness, prefixed to the volume before us, gives an excellent idea of Bersier's commanding appearance. The sermons convey perhaps as satisfactory an explanation as mere written sermons can convey of the marvellous success of the man who once delivered them. They may also serve as among the best of examples of the modern school of French Protestant pulpit discourses. We commend them to the attention of readers interested in this matter. They will doubtless find that no small element in their power is the purity and directness with which the simple Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ is presented and enforced upon the attention and acceptance of men. If the style loses much by translation, yet no one can fail to recognize its native vigor and terseness. Words serve merely as a means to an end. The speaker is not only in earnest, he is profoundly moved. Fervor is the grand characteristic; fervor without rant, without exaggeration of any kind. There are before the mind definite hearers with definite errors of doctrine and practice, and the orator has an unmistakable purpose in every sentence, in every word. We single out the fourth of these sermons as a favorable specimen of Bersier's skill in the statement of the prevailing errors in French thought and of his wisdom and power in refutation. Those who would like to know what the best of French preachers has to offer as a substitute for the essay which passes current in many quarters as a Christian sermon cannot do better, in our judgment, than to read this volume carefully and thoughtfully. HENRY M. BAIRD.

UNIVERSITY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

JOHN KENNETH MACKENZIE, MEDICAL MISSIONARY TO CHINA. By MRS. [MARY F.] BRYSON, London Mission, Tientsin. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co. [2d ed., 1891]. 12mo, pp. xiii., 404, $1.50.

A. M. MACKAY, PIONEER MISSIONARY OF THE

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY TO UGANDA. By his Sister. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 3d ed., 1891. 12mo, pp. viii., 488, $1.50.

John Kenneth Mackenzie first saw the light at Yarmouth, England, August 25th, 1850; and died at Tientsin, China, Easter Sunday, April 1, 1888. He may be said to have lived longer than most men, because he crowded so much work into his comparatively few days. After an experience of mission work at home he resolved to go to China as a medical missionary; graduated in medicine in 1874 and went to Hankow, where he led a very busy and useful life, not only as a physician and surgeon, but as a lay-preacher. In 1878 he got into some trouble not stated by his biographer, and went, in 1879, to Tientsin, where he stayed out his days. In the latter place he really did a great work. By a special Providence the Viceroy, Li-Hung Chang, became interested in his medical work, and actually set apart an entire quadrangle of the temple to Tsengkwoh-fan, one of the finest buildings in the city, for dispensary work, and, if necessary, for the reception of in-patients. Under such distinguished patronage the work prospered. A Chinese medical school was established, and by public subscription a hospital was erected. Mackenzie had the laboring oar in all these measures. He was hospital superintendent, dispensary chief, hospital visitor, surgeon, professor of the various branches of medicine—all at one and the same time. No wonder that under this accumulation he sank.

Mrs. Bryson brings out very clearly the fact that Mackenzie used his medical work as a mere means to spiritual influence. Enthusiastic as he was as a surgeon, able and devoted as a teacher, he was more enthusiastic and devoted as a lay-preacher. He had a genuine passion for souls, and valued his position and opportunities as a physician only because they gave him readier access to the people.

Mrs. Bryson's biography is well written. We wish, however, that she had given it an index, and also that she had avoided the common fault of amateur biographers—the omission of, or confusion about, the date of death. Thus this rather important fact in a biography is wholly omitted in the case of Mary Moffat in the biography by her son. In the present case one has to enter into an elaborate calculation to find out in what year and in what month and day the "Easter Day," mentioned (p. 367) as that of his death, fell! The Chinese money terms, *e.g.*, catty, teals, should be explained.

Mackay, whose name is pronounced as if spelled Mack-i, is one of the immortals. Whenever the story of Central Africa is told he must be mentioned; and in the annals of missionary biography there is no greater hero. Mackay was emphatically a man in the right place: a simple, upright, God-fearing man, who lived calmly amid innumerable daily perils, and impressed his holy character upon the heathen around. He was not an ordained missionary, nor a physician, but an engineer, yet he was called upon to preach and to minister to the sick. In fact, there was little that he was not called upon to do. He built boats and houses, mended instruments and fire-arms, taught school, translated the Bible and printed it, made converts, faced such dangerous enemies as the Arabs and the Jesuits, held the king in check, and in general made himself useful.

As one reviews his life one can see how he was prepared for it. Born at Rhynie in the county of Aberdeen, Scotland, on October 13th, 1849, early fonder of tools and machinery than of books, so that he spent his leisure time in workshops and shipyards, he grew up into an able-bodied lad, who was characterized by "a quiet, durable enthusiasm," steady, persevering habits, and retiring manners.

After studying engineering in Edinburgh, he went to Germany in 1873 to learn the language, and supported himself by the exercise of his profession; but his heart was soon enlisted in the cause of foreign missions, and in 1876 he left for Uganda. His life henceforth was crowded with perils, sufferings, anxieties, and varied labors. Most of the time he was alone among savages, or, if not absolutely without white companions, they were the French Roman Catholic priests who thwarted his plans and hindered his work. Stanley crossed his path, and the two have expressed their mutual admiration. Dr. Junker and Emin Pasha also visited him, but these visits were mere oases in the desert of his isolated existence. No one can read his story, told in his letters so simply, so modestly, yet so grandly, without spiritual quickening. Here was a man who without complaint endured hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. He had nothing personal to gain by it. He was not doing anything for pay, but verily he received a great reward. During the terrible months after the massacre of Bishop Hannington news from Uganda formed a paragraph occasionally in the papers. It was always the same—persecution was rife, anarchy reigned, but Mackay was still there, quietly holding on; all the other white men had fled. Noble Mackay! The heart of Christendom went out toward that servant of the Master, who in these degenerate days continued the line of heroes. On February 8th, 1890, *æt.* 41, Mackay succumbed to malarial fever, at Usambiro, never having seen his native land since he had left it seventeen years before. His native land? Such men have their citizenship in heaven!

We are grateful to Mackay's sister for her labor of love in compiling, from his letters and journals, his biography. We would suggest to her the propriety of giving in future editions the middle name of her brother—it does not appear in the American reprint at least, merely its initial *M.*; also to cause the publishers to insert a map which shall have upon it all the names which occur in the biography. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.

NEW YORK.

THE INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS; or, Thoughts on the Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to Come. Collected chiefly from English Writers. By L. P. With a Preface by H. S. Holland, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891. Cr. 8vo, pp. xxii., 374, $2.

This book is divided into four parts: I. Life in Time; II. Life through Death; III. Life beyond the Veil; IV. The Life Everlasting. Under each of these general heads the collector has gathered some of the best and most comforting thoughts on life and death from the most pious and illustrious writers of England, and has interspersed them with valuable selections from writers other than English. Everything in the book is bright, hopeful, and cheering. There is no controversy, no abstract argument, no dogmatic declamation. All is real, concrete, reliable. Each writer seems to speak from the fulness of his own Christian experience and from the tenderness of his love for all who are Christ's. The book is itself an illustration of the communion of saints. In it E. B. Pusey, J. H. Newman, H. E. Manning, Charles Kingsley, George Macdonald, Phillips Brooks, Richard Baxter, J. C. Shairp, and others equally diverse in regard to the things which separate Christians in this world, utter sentiments about the communion of saints and the life everlasting which each would probably adopt as his own. The book is well calculated to direct the mind's contemplation to things that lie beyond the visible and the tangible. In reading it the Christian feels that he belongs to an innumerable company of saints, of whom some have passed over the river, of whom some are on this side; all of whom have a common inheritance and enjoy a mutual ministry.

Mr. Holland's preface is taken up with a well-directed effort to commend the book to the interest and meditation of its readers. We agree with him in regarding it as admirably fitted to call the mind of Christians from that "other worldliness" which is now not unjustly charged against the comfortable and easy ways of so many Christians. "It stores and arranges the material by help of which our mind and imagination and will can follow the lines which pass up from this life into the eternal kingdom toward which we move. It shows us how much can be done in the way of fixing our meditation on a world which it is so difficult to embrace within our practical horizon." It makes the inheritance of the saints appear as a substantial and enduring reality. It is a good book, and will do good wherever it is read.

J. W. Richard.

Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

The Blessed Life: How to Find and Live It. By N. J. Hofmeyr, Senior Professor of the Theological College of the Dutch Reformed Church, Stellenbosch, Cape Colony. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891. 8vo, pp. 251, $1.

The chapters of this book were originally addresses—much after the fashion of the famous "Conferences" of Princeton Seminary—delivered weekly to Christian students in a South African theological college by one of its professors. This origin has left its mark upon the work. It has secured a certain intellectual tone much above that which is usually met in evangelistic discourses addressed to popular assemblies untrained in religious instruction. It exhibits a mental alertness, a modernness and originality of putting the fundamental things of salvation which is very refreshing. Withal, while novel in expression, it is entirely orthodox. Almost the only chapter over which any substantial difference of opinion would be expressed by evangelical theologians is that on "Assurance," where essentially the well-known views of the late Cesar Malan are expressed—views which are freely accepted by a large school of the Reformed as entirely scriptural, although some would probably consider them as asserted rather too confidently. "*Non cuivis contigit adire Corintho*," and some despondent but real disciple might be still further depressed by the standard of "assurance" here held up as without exception

But that is a very secondary matter. The book is divided into three parts: "On Returning to the Father." "On Surrendering to Christ," and "On Walking by the Spirit." Under each of these heads there are ten or a dozen brief chapters, each with a descriptive title. No one can familiarize himself with them, however long time a disciple, without a spiritual quickening. It is not a book for the work in the slums, nor among the grossly ignorant; but it is admirable to put in the hands of thoughtful men and women. What James's "Anxious Inquirer," Law's "Serious Call," and other now obsolete or obsolescent books of their type were to the awakened and interested of a half century or more ago, this "Blessed Life," with the tone and thrill of the nineteenth century in it, with its modern phrasing and fresh thought, should be to those of to-day. It is a remarkable book.

Mancius H. Hutton.

New Brunswick N. J.

Brief Reviews, by the Editor.

The Apostle Paul: A Sketch of the Development of his Doctrine, by *A. Sabatier*, Professor in the Faculty of Protestant Theology in Paris. Translated from the French. Edited, with an additional essay on the Pastoral Epistles, by George C. Findlay, B.A., author of "Galatians" in "The Expositor's Bible." (New York: James Pott & Co., 1891, 8vo, pp. xix., 402, $2.) The second edition of the French original, from which this translation apparently was made, bears date of 1881. It is, therefore, by no means an unknown book, but ranks high among works upon the Theology of the Epistles. Professor Sabatier has been fortunate in his English translator. It seldom occurs that a translation presents so exact a reproduction of the original, and yet reads so fully as though it were a primary production. Not only is the author's thought faithfully reproduced, but it is done in a style which ranks high as a specimen of graceful English. For the benefit of those who have not read the original, a few words may be said concerning the views and purposes of the author. He regards the doctrine of Paul as an outgrowth of his experience, and believes that it had a course of development parallel to the life of the apostle. Hence the varying forms it assumed, and here the ground of reconciliation of the divergences of the epistles on which such stress has been laid by the critics. The author therefore combines the exposition of the Pauline doctrine with the history of Paul's life. He also asserts that he is not "in the least obliged to strain the historical exegesis for the purpose of obtaining an artificial unity and resemblance. By accepting the idea of progress, it makes room for the variations of thought and expression which exist." With the translator we would say: "It is unnecessary to bespeak for this gifted representative of French Protestant scholarship a friendly reception upon English [and American] soil."

Over Sixty-Six Sacred Books; How they Came to Us, and what they Are, by *Edwin W. Rice*, D.D. (Philadelphia and New York: American Sunday-School Union, 1891, 12mo, pp. 133, 40 cents.) Dr. Rice's lectures, delivered by request before an advanced Bible-class upon the topics here discussed, were first printed in a monthly periodical and now in an enlarged form as a book. The subtitle indicates the ground covered: "A popular handbook for colleges, Sunday-schools, normal classes, and students, on the origin, authorship, preservation, character, and divine authority of the Christian Scriptures." Beginning with the Anglo-American Revision, Dr. Rice goes on to give in brief form the essential facts in regard to the other versions in various languages, the ancient manuscripts, and finally a brief "introduction" to both Testaments and to the separate books. The presentation is brief, but quite fair, though it is not difficult to perceive what position the author occupies upon critical questions.

Randolph has recently published a little duodecimo of 106 pages (60 cents), entitled *The Interpreter with his Bible*, by *A. E. Waffle*, A.M., which "is intended to meet the wants of persons who are anxious to study the Bible for themselves, but who have not had the advantages of a classical education." In this effort the author has made a book which is eminently orthodox and which is well calculated to accomplish its avowed purpose. Most of the material is familiar to the theological student and the minister, though a perusal would be of value to many such. The topics discussed are "The Interpreter Himself," "General Principles of Interpretation," and "The Interpretation of Figurative Language." The book is eminently intelligible and excellent in spite of some statements to which exception might be taken as insufficient (p. 79) or doubtful (p. 27). The recognition of various grades of "higher critics" (p. 6) is worthy of imitation elsewhere.

Two previous volumes of *The Sermon Bible* have received notice already. A new volume, covering the Gospel according to Luke and the first three chapters of John, has appeared. (New York: Armstrong, 1891, 8vo, pp. iv., 414, $1.50.) Abstracts of sermons by prominent preachers with references to other sermons are given in connection with the texts in their regular order. The reputation of the men whose work is here abstracted is excellent. It is to be regretted that the same cannot be said conscientiously of the book itself as a whole.

The Route of the Exodus. This is the title of a little pamphlet of 19 pages octavo, by *Edouard Naville*, D. Lit., Ph.D., containing an address before the Victoria Institute (London), 1891. The author is the well-known Egyptologist and explorer, whose name will ever be connected with his famous discovery of the site of Pithom, one of the "store-cities" of the second Ramses. A considerable part of the material of this publication was contained in the volume which recorded that discovery. The significance of that event lies in the identity of Pithom with Succoth, the second station on the Exodus route. Its definite location made the old theory of the place of crossing the Red Sea difficult to maintain. This little paper contains in brief form the main facts and features of the newer view. It is from the hand of a master, and should be consulted. An excellent outline map accompanies the address. The victoria Institute is located at 8 Adelphi Terrace, Strand, London, W. C.

The Doctrine of the Episcopal Church so Far as it is Set Forth in the Prayer-Book, digested and arranged by *Henry R. Percival*, M.A., S.T.D., Rector of the Church of the Evangelists, Philadelphia. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1892, 12mo, pp. vi., 103, 75 cents.) In the main this little volume contains a compilation from the Prayer-Book, the extracts being ranged under the ordinary headings of a theological system. As such it is very convenient and extremely useful, showing how much of doctrine is thus taught; but the compiler's chief aim has been to enter a protest against those who wish to minimize the vows taken in ordination, boasting of an exceedingly "roomy" church. There is a great deal to be said in favor of the view which is here presented with much earnestness and deep conviction. The subscription to the doctrinal statements for which the writer contends is elastic enough to suit any reasonable demands, and yet strict enough to exclude those who evidently have no right within the bounds of the Episcopal communion. The first portion of the book "claims to possess a quasi-authoritative character," as it evidently must to those who accept the book on which it is founded; but in the second part, where the author has added his own explications of certain points of doctrine, we think that he has done less well. Instances might be cited where traditionalism and liberal thought, Arminianism and Calvinism are strangely mingled. Undoubtedly the book would have been stronger and had a greater influence if the Prayer-Book had been allowed to speak for itself without added comment.

The First Doctrine of the Christian Church. Letters and addresses from a few eminent advocates of the Scriptural Theology of Conditional Immortality, read before a late Convention of the Young Ministers' Christian Union of the United States of America, with publisher's preface. (Providence: Snow & Farnham, 1891, 12mo, pp. xix., 79.) This long title belongs to a small book. Claims are put forth to the adherence of many eminent men to the dogma indicated. In the preface we are told that "many more" are now "secretly committed" to this view (p. vii.), "which alone displays both the *mercy and justice of God*" (p. xv.). According to it "Christian dogmatics need to be readjusted" (p. 13). Those who hold to the received view are virtually accused of reading the Bible with one eye shut or of gluing some pages together (p. 20). The scholarly character of the book is made dubious by the fact that on p. 21 the only Greek word in it contains two blunders which render it unrecognizable! The list of authorities appended is one of the queerest pieces of bibliography which we ever saw. The veriest tyro ought to be ashamed of it. In the argument itself there is nothing new, and the exegesis is startlingly though eclectically literal.

Darkness and Dawn; or, Scenes in the Days of Nero: An Historic Tale, by *Frederic W. Farrar*, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster. (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891, 8vo, pp. xiii., 594, $2.) The most obvious criticism of this book is that it is too long. The volume contains a vast amount of matter, and even the interest that one naturally feels in both subject and writer is put to a considerable strain. It is too much to expect that the book shall contain a well-arranged plot, like other tales of romance, and yet there is a thread which runs through the whole giving it what of unity it possesses. Those who read it for the story alone will be apt to be disappointed, though in this respect the book is a notable addition to its class; while those who seek for incidental information of a historical and archæological nature will find much of such material. Furthermore, they can rely upon the correctness of the statements of fact, while the element of fiction is of such a sort as to be quite within the bounds of possibility. To most readers there will be opened a view of the history of the time both wider and more vivid than anything which may have chanced to fall under their notice. A *Zeitgeschichte* in this form will probably reach and instruct more readers than a book professedly scientific and laboriously learned could do.

A History of Christianity. From the German of Professor *Rudolph Sohm*, Leipsic. By *Charles*

W. Rishell, M.A., with revisions, notes, and additions. (Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe; New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891, 12mo, pp. 370, $1.) Though of very moderate size, this translation, with the additions which the editor has appended as notes or inserted in the shape of new chapters, has not the forbidding appearance which so many brief histories have. It is not merely a presentation of dates with as little text as the writer could consistently give, but it is a narrative or account with such dates as are needed to make plain the historical sequence of events. It is commendable because it is a readable book instead of a mere chronological statement. The only criticism upon it is that it is necessarily put in such a concise form that one would be compelled to have a good encyclopædia at hand at times to fill up some of the gaps which even the editor's notes have left. There are three sections appended which give some account of the Church in Great Britain and America, and also of Methodism in particular. To give a rapid view of the whole field, the volume will be found valuable, especially to laymen, from the very form in which it is cast.

Forty Years among the Zulus, by *Josiah Tyler*, missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. (Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1891, 8vo, pp. 300, $1.25.) When reading the introduction to this volume, by Dr. Lamson, we were led to expect great pleasure and profit from the book itself. After reading it there is no hesitation in pronouncing fully justified that noble tribute to a noble man engaged in a noble work. The author has learned the secret of interesting writing, and there is not a dull page in the whole composition. It is the work of a man on fire with enthusiasm, and as an argument in favor of foreign missions it is worth countless volumes of generalities and phrases. The style of the writer is plain, vivid, and easy to read. One seems transported to the field of his labors, and feels the contagion of a deep interest and the conviction that the results justify the labor and the money expended in the prosecution of the work. The book should be widely read.

Morning Light in Many Lands, by *Daniel March*. (Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1891, 8vo, pp. 416, $2.) This book gives the author's account of what he saw during a considerable part of a journey of forty thousand miles and during a year and a half, and yet it is not a book of travels which frightens us with the ill-concealed skeleton of an earth-encircling itinerary. Unlike the "globe-trotter," who says that he never saw a missionary or a convert from heathenism (simply because he never looked for them), Dr. March saw many of both, and took pains to learn all that he could about them in as exhaustive a manner as possible. He has made a study of missions, and has brought back a remarkable report. It is the more interesting since he did not go as an agent or a promoter, but simply as an individual and private investigator. In this volume he gives us his conclusions, reached after questioning of hundreds of missionaries and natives, after careful study and painstaking inquiry. The results at which he has arrived will gladden the hearts of those who are so deeply interested in the success of this great cause. His report of open doors and ready, eager hearers of the Gospel message may seem rose-colored to many, but those who look for the ultimate triumph of the Cross will find their hands stayed up by his encouraging words.

The book itself is handsome, the type clear, and the paper excellent. The author's style is most pleasing and easy withal, so that the reader is carried along without labor or fatigue. At times a spiritual lesson is drawn from outward scenes, but usually such digressions are edifying and instructive. The observer was a man of hard-headed common sense, and he has given us some descriptions of things which he characterizes with expressive and pungent adjectives. The good which the book is calculated to do warrants the hope that it will find many readers.

Native Life in India, being sketches of the Social and Religious Characteristics of the Hindus, by the Rev. *Henry Rice*, Madras. Revised. (Oakland, Cal.: Pacific Press Publishing Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 160, 60 cents.) We have here an American edition of a work published first by the Religious Tract Society of London, under the title "Native Life in South India." It is substantially the same work, though some things have been omitted because they were thought to be of little interest to the younger readers for whom this edition is intended. The type and paper are good, the style is clear and plain, and the matter is of interest so far as it goes. As the work is based upon an intimate acquaintance of eighteen years with the people and scenes described, we have an authentic account and one calculated to meet admirably the purpose which the writer had in mind.

Robert Carter: His Life and Work, 1807–89. (New York: Randolph & Co., 1891, 8vo, pp. ix., 250, $1.50.) "This book is written for the friends of Robert Carter." Thus writes the author, a loving and devoted daughter. The words are true, and the friends are not so few that the book will have a small sale if each friend should become a purchaser. He was a man very widely known, beloved and honored not only within the bounds of his denomination, but also among a multitude of associates in all professions and on both sides of the sea. To all these this volume will be a most welcome memorial, the more so because it gives so vivid a picture of the man and his character, his work and his life. Every page is full of interest, and even those who had not the privilege of his personal acquaintance are made to feel the force and honesty of his character, the conscientiousness which he showed in his work, and the sincerity and earnestness of his life. The author has quoted largely from Mr. Carter's own words and descriptions, as well as from many who knew and honored her father. Her task has been well performed, though it is easy to imagine that a far larger book might have been prepared. Out of the wealth of anecdote it is difficult to select anything for special mention. Perhaps a little incident will illustrate his principles as well as a longer one. His reply to the man who wanted to have him publish a volume on "The Divine Right of Presbyterian Church Government" was rather disconcerting, coming from a stanch Scotch Presbyterian, when he denied the main proposition. Similarly he refused a volume on "The Difficulties of Arminian Methodism," saying, "Pulling down may be necessary; but I did not go into business to do that, but to *build up* Christ's Church as far as is in my power." The death of such a man is a loss to the world. Even those who were forced to disagree with him in some points could not fail to do honor to the man, of whom it is said that his prayers caused Dr. Musgrave to change his views upon the reunion of the Presbyterian Church, so that he became its earnest advocate.

The Influence of the Netherlands in the Making of the English Commonwealth and the American Republic, with Notice of what the Pilgrims learned in Holland, their Treatment by the Government and People, and Answers to Criticisms made upon the proposed Delfshaven Memorial. A paper read before the Boston Congregational Club, October 26th, 1891, by *William Elliot Griffis*, D.D., Chairman of the Delfshaven Memorial Committee. (Boston: De Wolfe, Fiske & Co., pp. 40, 15 cents.) The title of this little pamphlet is so full that it is unnecessary to further describe its contents. The plan of erecting a memorial at Delfshaven is one that has aroused a great deal of enthusiasm and some determined opposition and criticism. We have already mentioned one of the pamphlets against it. Dr. Griffis is firmly convinced of the untenable character of the adverse criticism, and after careful study on both sides of the sea has prepared the present paper. It only faintly echoes the praise which is due to the writer to say that he ought to go on with the investigations here indicated, and expand their limits to those of a volume. The Dutch influence upon England and the American debt to the Netherlands ought to be brought out in their full significance. In the mean time, those interested will find food for thought in this essay, and the hands of those who are committed to the Delfshaven Memorial will be strengthened as well.

Talks to Sunday-School Teachers, by *Joseph Goodwin Terrill.* (Syracuse, N. Y.: A. W. Hall, 1891, 12mo, pp. xv., 192, 75 cents.) This little book had its inception in an attempt to meet felt wants in a practical and useful way. It is adapted to use in all sorts of localities and conditions, and to almost all grades of Sabbath-school teachers. The author has endeavored to put into his pages a large amount of instruction and a great many hints while yet furnishing a cheap book. In this effort he has succeeded. With this outline as a text-book for study at the weekly teachers' meeting, there should be a constantly growing excellence in the quality of the instruction. Anything which will assist in this direction is to be welcomed. The glimpses which the author gives into the philosophy of mind and morals will enable the teacher to grasp the true method of instructing, and lead to a higher order of teacher. Our only objection is to the extremely modernized shape which is given to some of the biblical teachings; "the old is better."

As a slight token of interdenominational comity we have a volume of discourses, comprising a "series of sermons delivered in the Old John Street Methodist Episcopal Church" in this city, by prominent ministers of the vicinity. The title *Interdenominational Sermons* is perhaps not as felicitous as might be, but the contents of the book are in every way excellent. As might be expected, the selection contains the ripened thought of men well known in their own denominations or in far wider circles, so that the reader has in brief space specimens of the style of thought and mode of diction of twenty-five ministers and several laymen as well. Having been delivered to audiences of business men, who turned aside from their occupations to attend this series of sermons, the care with which they were selected and the interest and importance of their lessons may be taken for granted. Each sermon is accompanied by a portrait of the preacher. (New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891, pp. viii., 325, $1.25.)

QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

The Andover Review, Boston, Jan., 1892.

"The Mediating Function of the Christian Minister of To-day," by Rev. Philip S. Moxom, Boston, starts from the proposition, hardly to be gainsaid by anybody, that the Christian work of to-day must be done by men of to-day, and winds up by suggesting that Christian ministers are called upon to-day, more imperatively than ever before, to mediate between conflicting social classes and render the most effective aid in solving the pressing social problems. The second article of the number, "The Expansion of the Local Church," by A. E. Dunning, D.D., Boston, is of a homogeneous character. It shows that the idea of reorganizing the churches so as to secure for them greater influence and efficiency in proportion to their investments of men and money has become so stirring as to naturally call forth propositions of actual changes; and then it points to the expansion of the local Church as a fit measure to begin with. A well-written article, "Missionary Problems in the Turkish Empire," by Rev. Charles C. Starbuck, Andover, gives much intimate and interesting information about the Protestant mission in Asia Minor and its delicate relations to the old and somewhat degenerated Christian churches in those regions. Among other topics discussed in the present number are "The Proposed Reform of the Grammar School Curriculum," by Professor D. Collin Wells, and "Paul's Rabbinic Education," by Rev. Samuel Weyler.

The Baptist Quarterly Review, New York, Jan., 1892.

The exposition of "Aristotle's Conception of God," by James Ten Brocke, Ph.D., Yale University, demonstrates that it contains no idea of God as Providence, and finds in this point the chief difference between what Greek philosophy found out about God and what the Christian religion has revealed. "Some Elements of Pulpit Power," by Rev. B. D. Thomas, D.D., Toronto, Ont., is a vindication of the office the pulpit fills in modern society over against, for instance, the claims of the press. "The New Humanity," by Rev. R. E. Neighbor, Mt. Vernon, Ohio, is a study in the theology of Paul, more especially of Eph. ii. 14–18; and "The Apostles' Creed," by Professor J. C. Long, LL.D., Crozer Theological Seminary, is a study of the origin of that creed.

The Charities Review, New York, Jan., 1892.

The number contains a biographical sketch, by Alexander Johnson, of Oscar Carlton McCulloch, the late president of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, telling facts and no conventionalities; a report, by Robert W. de Forest, of the controversy concerning the Christmas Society—both sides of the case, and no unnecessary commentaries; an article by Bolton Hall, "The Effect of Taxations upon Pauperism," showing that grinding taxes out of the poorest class is to grind it down into pauperism. Of particular interest is "A Study of some New York Tenement-House Problems," by E. T. Potter, because this whole topic has of late been made the subject of much sensational writing of an entirely useless unpleasantness.

The Expositor, London, Jan., 1892.

The first part of "The Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament," by Rev. Professor Joseph Agar Beet, D.D., treats the doctrine as it appears in the synoptic gospels, and the third part of "The Present Position of the Johannean Question," by Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D., Oxford, treats of the relation between the Gospel according to St. John and the synoptic gospels. "St. Paul's First Journey in Asia Minor," by Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A., gives a number of valuable notes, by which it becomes possible to fix the exact situations of the localities visited by Paul and Barnabas more precisely than it has hitherto been done. "The Miracles of Christ," by Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Dean of Armagh, who has also adorned the opening page with a beautiful hymn, demonstrates the vanity of any attempt to retain the ethical forces of Christianity after rejecting its supernatural contents. The number also contains a lecture on "Gideon," by the late W. G. Elmslie; a notice of the death of Abraham Kuenen, by Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Canon of Rochester, and "Old Testament Notes," by the same author.

Good Words, London, Jan., 1892.

The present number contains, besides some poetry and stories, several instructive and well-illustrated sketches or studies, as "Tewksbury Abbey," by H. M. Spence, D.D., Dean of Gloucester; "The Relics of St. Fillan," by Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bart.; "The Wrinkles on the Face of Mother Earth," by Professor H. A. Green, and for its Sunday Reading, "The Day of Judgment," by Rev. W. Page Roberts, M.A.

The Methodist Review (Bi-monthly), New York and Cincinnati, Jan.–Feb., 1892.

"The Virgin-Birth," by Professor Wilbur Fletcher Steele, Ph.D., Berlin, Germany, is a learned and elaborate study of the questions when did the idea and knowledge of the virgin-birth enter the public mind? and what evidence is there that the hostile Jews of Christ's days knew of and denied such claim? The next article is the second part of "Genesis of the New Testament," by Professor L. T. Townsend, S.T.D., Boston; and there follows a piece of particular interest, "The Problem of Education in the Southern States," by J. C. Hartzell, Corresponding Secretary of the Freedmen's Aid Society, Cincinnati. It is well argued and carefully proven, but it ends with that somewhat appalling sentence, that "what has hitherto been done for this cause is scarcely a beginning." "The Province of Philosophy," by William Riley Halstead, D.D., Bloomington, Ind., indicates the intimate though delicate relation between philosophy and religion; and "The Portico to Our Book of Discipline," by William F. Warren, S.T.D., Boston, gives a criticism and proposes an amendment of the opening sentences of the Methodist Book of Discipline. A careful investigation, "Wesley as a Scientist," by W. C. Cahall, M.D., Philadelphia, is also of great interest.

The Missionary Review, London, New York, Toronto, Jan., 1892.

The title of the article "The Gospel Afloat" will strike the reader as a little peculiar. The article gives an account of a new enterprise by which Dr. McAll hopes to make his work of evangelization in France still more efficient, and the enterprise consists in a new mission boat especially adapted for French waters. The account is very interesting, but the title seems rather unfit to catch and direct the attention. Other interesting articles are "Christian Missions and the Highest Use of Wealth," by Merrill Edward Gates, LL.D., "Chinese Blue Books," etc.

The New Englander and Yale Review, New Haven, Jan., 1892.

The first article, "Abolitionists and Prohibitionists," is the wisdom of one experience, already made, applied to another experience, now making—a bit of the philosophy of history unfolded at a place where history seems about to repeat itself; an analysis of the abolitionist movement and the embarrassment its ultraism caused sunk into the prohibitionist movement now going on, in order to eliminate what ultraism it may contain. In a similar manner the last article, "Criminology," by Arthur MacDonald, may be called an extended and, with fit examples, illustrated definition of what criminology is, generally, specially, and practically. Among the other articles are "Philadelphia," by Barr Ferree—a study in morals; "Some Letters of the Younger Pliny," by Samuel Ball Platner—a study of character; and "Should Marriages be Indissoluble?" by Thomas S. Potwin, which question, on the authority of the New Testament, is answered thus: "The indissolubility of marriage should be aimed at the ideal of the Christian conscience, but not enacted into law to be enforced.

The Old and New Testament Student, Hartford, Conn., Jan., 1892.

The present number contains the portrait of Samuel Ives Curtis, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary, accompanied with a biographical sketch by Professor George H. Gilbert, Ph.D.; the first part of "The Discovery and Decipherment of the Cuneiform Inscriptions," by Robert Francis Harper, Ph.D., and "A College Teacher of the Bible," by Charles F. Thwing. The question "Shall the Teachings of Jesus be Taken Literally?" by Rev. Arthur S. Phelps, B.D., Denver, Col., refers not to the devotional ecstasies of one hundred years ago, nor to the doctrinal controversies of fifty years ago, but to the practical obedience of to-day.

Our Day, Boston and Chicago, Jan., 1892.

Two articles of the present number, "National Precedents for Sunday Closing of the World's Fair," by Rev. William C. Wood, Boston, and the "Boston Monday Lectures," by Joseph Cook, treat the same subject; and in a similar manner the subject of Mormonism is considered twice by different writers and from different aspects. The reader will find this method of making up a number of a monthly of great efficiency. Specially interesting is "Inadequate Theological Education in England," by Professor D. W. Simon, Edinburgh.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, Philadelphia, Jan., 1892.

"Ritschl's Theology," by Rev. Charles M. Mead, D.D., Boston, has the appearance of being only a rapid survey of the most prominent features of the principal school of present German theology and a preliminary investigation of the reasons why that school has made an unfavorable impression upon the writer; but it is in reality a complete exposition of the essential character of Ritschl's theological system and a searching criticism of the tendencies it involves. The exposition is a little schismatical, because given in detached thesis whose inner connection is not apparent at first glance, but it is clear, precise, easy to grasp, and impossible to mistake; and as the criticism proceeds the organic connection becomes apparent, and the tendencies involved stand out with decisive sharpness. The author thinks that the system, or at least an influence of it, will one day put in its appearance on American soil. If so, it cannot be said any more to coerce sin introduced. "Satan in the Old Testament," by Rev. Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., LL.D., New York, is a learned study, often very acute in its details, and presenting questions almost from every branch of the theological system. Besides "Socialism," by Rev. James McGregor, D.D., Omaroo, New Zealand, and "Religious Thought in the Russian Empire," by Rev. Nicholas Bjerriny, New York, both of which articles at many points touch upon the relation between socialism and Christianity, the present number also contains "Christianity and Social Problems," by Professor Charles A. Aiken, D.D., Princeton, in which the writer undertakes to consider some of the offices of Christianity in respect to the social problems of to-day from the platform that every social question is at heart a moral question. The article "Jean Astruc," by Professor Howard Osgood, D.D., LL.D., Rochester, N. Y., is a characterization of that author, drawn partly from his own acts, partly from the environment in which he lived, and throws a very strange but very striking light on his notorious "Conjectures."

The Reformed Quarterly Review, Philadelphia, Jan., 1892.

The answer which Professor Thomas G. Apple, D.D., LL.D., gives to the question "What is the Bible?" turns upon the fact that the Bible is a closed canon, which, however, does not exclude the idea of a progressive interpretation, and in the same direction points "The Inspiration of the Bible," by Rev. W. Rupp, D.D., repudiating the claim of absolute infallibility for the Bible on dogmatic grounds as something not at all needed in order to make the Bible a sufficient record of the divine revelation. "The Trend of History," by Rev. J. B. Rust, A.M., is an investigation of the true philosophy of history, learned and circumspect. In "Sunday Observance," by Rev. F. K. Levan, D.D., a paper read before the Association of Reformed Ministers and Elders for Spiritual Conference, the author considers the question both from its historical aspects and as a scriptural injunction. "Simon Bar Jona," by Mrs. T. C. Porter, is a psychological study with a specifically religious bearing.

The Sunday Magazine, Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Jan., 1892.

Besides its instalments of fiction, "Half-Brothers," by Hesba Stretton, "The Home Secretary," by Carmen Sylva, etc., and several well-illustrated sketches, "The Jewish Colony in London," by Mrs. Brewer, "Industries of the Holy Land," by Rev. W. Mann Stathan, and "Beyond the Frosty Caucasus," by Michael A. Morrison, the present number contains a sermon by H. Montagu Butler, D.D., "Obedient unto Death," and an article by J. Monro Gibson, D.D., "Infinite and Infinitesimal," which demonstrates the grandeur of the Old Testament's idea of God, both with reference to His infinite power and with reference to His infinitesimal care.

The Thinker, London, Jan., 1892.

"The Epiphany," by Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D., is an exposition of Isa. lx. 1, and "Thieves and Robbers," by Rev. Professor H. R. Reynolds, an exposition of John x. 8. "Inspiration and Criticism," by Rev. Professor J. Iverach, D.D., is a well-considered and well-written survey of the true relation between the inspiration of the Bible and biblical criticism, and seems to offer some points of efficient reconciliation between two opposing schools. The very interesting article "Mrs. Besant's Doubt, and Her Interview with Dr. Pusey," by Rev. Principal Charles Chapman, LL.D., will be found whole in the body of the present number of our magazine. "The Ten Pieces of Silver," by Mrs. E. A. Finn, is an antiquary note to Luke xv. 8, 9, and "Christ's Pre-eminence in all Things," by Rev. Professor Joseph Agar Beet, D.D., is a commentary on Col. i. 18.

The Presbyterian Quarterly, Richmond, Va., Jan., 1892.

"The Christo-centric Principle of Theology," by L. Girardeau, D.D., LL.D., is a criticism of the "Institutes of the Christian Theology," by Professor Emanuel V. Gerhart, D.D., LL.D., Lancaster, Pa., or rather of the constructive principle of the theological system therein set forth. In "Dr. Briggs's Biblical Theology Traced to its Organific Principle," Professor Robert Watts, D.D., LL.D., Belfast, Ireland, tries to show that, under the guise of a result of modern ethical and religious philosophy, it is the old traditional Pelagian heresy which moves in the Inaugural of Dr. Briggs and forms his standpoint. "The Scriptural Limits of Denominationalism," by J. A. Waddell, D.D., seeks in the Scriptures themselves a remedy against the chaotic condition of Protestant Christianity. James MacGregor, D.D., Oamaru, New Zealand, opens his essay on the "Bearings of Socialism on Morality and Religion" with the question whether socialism ought not to be saved from utter rejection on account of its atheism by regard to the circumstance that it has an ethic which to some extent is coincident with the Christian ethic? which question he answers by the remark that a pirate ship has a discipline that is much the same as that of the royal navy; and he goes on in the same explicit, unmistakable manner. "The Four Gospels," by E. C. Murray, is an exposition of their distinctive characteristics, and "Robert Browning," by W. S. Currell, Ph.D., a study not of the poet, but of the man.

The Homiletic Review, New York, London, Toronto, Jan., 1892.

In "Present Aspects of Nature and Revelation as Related to Each Other" Sir J. William Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., Montreal, Canada, shows that various recent forms of natural religion are not only reconcilable with, but cognate to, and in some degree contained in, the religion of Jesus Christ. In "The Methodology of the Higher Criticism" Professor Robert Watts, D.D., LL.D., Belfast, Ireland, demonstrates the very method of the whole process as utterly unscientific. "What Ails Buddhism?" by J. T. Gracey, D.D., Rochester, N. Y., gives an interesting analysis of the whole myth or story of Gautama Buddha, and "Have the Monuments and Papyri Anything to Say of the Hebrews and the Exodus?" by Rev. Camden M. Cobern, Ph.D., Ann Arbor, Mich., discusses and clears up the relation between Hebrew and Egyptian history.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH REVIEW.

Philadelphia, January, 1892.

Rev. J. A. Johnson.
Christmas Joys. A. W. Upshaw.
Eugenie's Mistake. Victoria Earle.
The Value of a Classical Education. Rev. W. L. Brown, A.M.
The Model Teacher in our Country Schools. Charles L. Moore.
Ideal Culture Essential to Exalted Character. Mrs. J. P. Sampson.
The True Use of Knowledge. Rev B. F. Combush, B.D.
Barh Fofoe: a Bassa Boy.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, January, 1892.

The Mediating Function of the Christian Minister of To-Day. Rev. Philip S. Moxom.
The Expansion of the Local Church. A. E. Dunning, D.D.
Missionary Problems in the Turkish Empire. Rev. Charles C. Starbuck.
The Apprentice System of the United States Navy. Lieutenant Wadhams.
The Proposed Reform of the Grammar-School Curriculum. Prof. D. Collin Wells.
The Great Love. Christian Van der Veen, D.D.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

New York, January, 1892.

Aristotle's Conception of God. James Ten Brocke, Ph.D.
Some Elements of Pulpit Power. Rev. B. D. Thomas, D.D.
The Economics of Higher Education. Pres. David J. Hill, D.D.
The New Humanity. Rev. R. E. Neighbor.
Church Offices. Rev. Isaac N. Carman.
Christianity and the Saxons. John Hart, Sr.
The Apostles' Creed. Prof. J. C. Long, LL.D.

THE CHARITIES REVIEW.

New York, January, 1892.

Oscar Carlton McCulloch. Alexander Johnson.
The Christmas Society and its Critics. Robert W. De Forest.
The Effect of Taxation upon Pauperism. Bolton Hall.
Every-Day Economy. Mrs. Georgia B. Jenks.
A Study of Some New York Tenement-House Problems. E. T. Potter.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, January, 1892.

The Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament, I. Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, D.D.
The Present Position of the Johannean Question, III. Rev. Prof. W. Sanday, D.D.
St. Paul's First Journey in Asia Minor. Prof. W. M. Ramsay, M.A.
The Miracles of Christ. Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.
The Book of Lamentations. Rev. James Stalker, D.D.
Abraham Kuenen. Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Edinburgh, January, 1892.

Arnold Toynbee. Eleanor F. Jourdain.
The Epistle to the Hebrews in the Syrian Church. Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, B.D.
The Teaching of Our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament. Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D.
The Old Testament in the Light of the Literature of Assyria and Babylonia. Theodore G. Pinches.

GOOD WORDS.

London, January, 1892.

The Magic Ink, I., II. William Black.
Tewksbury Abbey. The Dean of Gloucester.
Sunshine Johnson. Luke Sharp.
Highland Smugglers.
The Relics of St. Fillan. Sir Herbert Maxwell.
The Wrinkles of the Face of Mother Earth. Prof. A. H. Green.
Alston Crucis, Chapters i., ii. Helen Shipton.
The Day of Judgment. Rev. W. Page Roberts, M.A.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York, London, and Toronto, January, 1892.

Present Aspects of Nature and Revelation as Related to Each Other. Sir J. William Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S.
The Methodology of the Higher Criticism Demonstrably Unscientific. Prof. Robert Watts, D.D., LL.D.
What ails Buddhism? J. T. Gracey, D.D.
Have the Monuments and Papyri Anything to Say of the Hebrews and the Exodus? Rev. Camden M. Cobern, Ph.D.
Sermonic Section.
Exegetical and Expository Section.
Miscellaneous Section.

METHODIST REVIEW.

New York and Cincinnati, January, 1892.

The Virgin-Birth. Prof. Wilbur Fletcher Steele, Ph.D.
Genesis of the New Testament. Prof. L. T. Townsend, S.T.D.
The Problem of Education in the Southern States. J. C. Hartzell.
The Province of Philosophy. William Riley Halstead, D.D.
The Portico to our Book of Discipline. William F. Warren, S.T.D.
Personality in Authorship. Prof. W. A. Heidel.
Wesley as a Scientist. W. C. Cahall.
Theism. J. M. Williams, D.D.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW.

London and New York, Toronto, January, 1892.

Christian Missions and the Highest Use of Wealth. Merrill Edward Gates, D.D.
The Gospel Afloat. Rev. Robert W. McAll, D.D.
Apostolic Missions and their Results.
Narayan Sheshadri. George Smith, D.D.

THE NEWBERY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, January, 1892.

The Universities and Elementary Education. Rev. F. L. H. Millard.
Sacramental Confession. Rev. W. F. Hobson.
Clergy Pensions. Rev. S. J. Eales, D.C.L.
The Anglo-Catholic Movement among the Jews. Rev. F. Arnold.
Sidney Smith. Mrs. L. B. Walford.
Our Village Churches. W. H. Davenport-Adams.
Unpublished Fragments of Coleridge and Lamb. W. T. Brooke.
No Compromise. XXI.–XXIII. Helen F. Hetherington and Rev. H. Darwin Burton.
The World of Insects. Agnes Giberne.
Mrs. Picket. J. Carmichael.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

New Haven, Conn., January, 1892.

Abolitionists and Prohibitionists.
The Marble Faun. Martha Tyler Gale.
Should Marriages be Indissoluble? Thomas S. Potwin.
Philadelphia, a Study in Morals. Barr Feree.
Some Letters of the Younger Pliny. Samuel Ball Platner.
Criminology. Arthur MacDonald.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., January, 1892.

Samuel Ives Curtis. Prof. George H. Gilbert, Ph.D.
The Discovery and Decipherment of the Cuneiform Inscriptions. Robert Francis Harper, Ph.D.
A College Teacher of the Bible. Charles F. Thwing.
Shall the Teachings of Jesus be taken Liberally? Rev. Arthur S. Phelps, B.D.
Biblical Studies at the German Universities. Rev. George S. Goodspeed, Ph.D.
The Founding of the Christian Church. Clyde W. Votaw.

OUR DAY.

Boston and Chicago, January, 1892.

National Precedents for Sunday Closing of the World's Fair. Rev. William C. Wood.
Inadequate Theological Education in England. Prof. D. W. Simon.
Woman Suffrage as a Weapon in Vital Reforms. Julia Ward Howe.
Boston Hymn. Joseph Cook.
Boston Monday Lectures. Joseph Cook.

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW.

Philadelphia, January, 1892.

Ritschl's Theology. Charles M. Mead.
Satan in the Old Testament. Talbot W. Chambers.
Socialism. James MacGregor.
Christianity and Social Problems. Charles A. Aiken.
Jean Astruc. Howard Osgood.
Religious Thought in the Russian Empire. Nicholas Bjerring.
Recent Works in Old Testament Textual Criticism. Lewis B. Paton.
Two Points as to Our Supply of Ministers. Willis J. Beecher.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

Richmond, Va., January, 1892.

The Christo-centric Principle of Theology. John L. Girardeau.
Dr. Briggs's Biblical Theology Traced to its Organific Principle. Robert Watts, D.D., LL.D.
The Scriptural Limits of Denominationalism. J. A. Waddell, D.D.
Bearings of Socialism on Morality and Religion. James Mac-Gregor, D.D.
The Four Gospels. E. C. Murray.
Robert Browning. W. S. Currell, Ph.D.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Philadelphia, January, 1892.

What is the Bible? Prof. Thomas G. Apple, D.D., LL.D.
Ye are Complete in Him. Rev. S. N. Callender, D.D.

The Inspiration of the Bible.
Rev. W. Ruff, D.D.
The Trend of History.
Rev. J. B. Rust, A.M.
Personal Consecration to Christ.
Rev. J. N. Noss.
Sunday Observance.
Rev. F. K. Levan, D.D.
Simon Bar-Jona. Mrs. T. C. Porter.

SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Jan., 1892.

Half-Brothers. Chapters i.-v.
Hesba Stretton.
Obedient unto Death.
H. Montagu Butler, D.D.
The Jewish Colony in London.
Mrs. Brewer.
Industries of the Holy Land.
Rev. W. Mann Stathan.
Barbarous Millinery. Mary Harrison.
Beyond the Frosty Caucasus.
Michael A. Morrison.
Infinite and Infinitesimal.
J. Monro Gibson, D.D.
Our Children's Shelter.
Baroness Burdett-Coutts.
The Home Secretary. I.
Carmen Sylvia.

THE THINKER.

London, January, 1892.

The Epiphany.
Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.
Thieves and Robbers.
Rev. Prof. H. R. Reynolds, D.D.
Inspiration and Criticism.
Rev. Prof. I. Iverach, D.D.
Mrs. Besant's Doubt and her Interviews with Dr. Pusey.
Rev. Principal Charles Chapman, LL.D.
The Ten Pieces of Silver.
Mrs. E. A. Finn.
Christ's Pre-eminence in All Things.
Rev. Prof. Joseph Agar Beet, D.D.

THE TREASURY.

New York, January, 1892.

The Hero Prophet. Rev. George Adams.
Christ the Christian's Supreme Motive.
Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D.
The Great Intercessor's New Year's Petition. John T. Wells, D.D.
Words of Warning for Young People.
William M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Sheol. Prof. Thomas Hill Rich.
Divine and Human Agency in Revivals.
John Gordon, D.D.
Higher Criticism. Rev. B. Douglass.
Common Sense in Exegesis.
Prof. Austin Phelps, D.D.

THE YOUNG MAN.

New York and Chicago, January, 1892.

His Life in his Hand.
George Manville Fenn.
Books that Have Moved Me.
W. J. Dawson.
The Home Life of Mr. Gladstone.
Health Sermons for Young Men.
Gordon Stables, M.D.
When I was a Young Man.
Prof. John Stuart Blackie.

CONTENTS OF THE FEBRUARY MAGAZINES.

Harper's Magazine for February contains the beginning of a remarkably attractive series of papers describing a canoe voyage in 1891 down the Danube, "From the Black Forest to the Black Sea." The first article of the series is written by Poultney Bigelow, and superbly illustrated from drawings made, during the voyage, by Alfred Parsons and F. D. Millet. Julian Ralph contributes to this number another of his valuable and entertaining papers on the great Northwest, and under the somewhat enigmatical title of "A Skin for a Skin," describes the fur-trading industries of British North America and the operations of the once powerful Hudson Bay Company. The article is accompanied by several strikingly original illustrations drawn by Frederic Remington. Another paper of peculiar historic as well as local interest is an account of the "Old Shipping Merchants of New York," written by George W. Sheldon, and appropriately illustrated from drawings by C. D. Gibson and F. H. Schell and from paintings by Eaton and Nagle. A valuable article on "The Royal Danish Theatre," illustrated by Hans Tegner and others, is contributed by William Archer. The very interesting series of "Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne," by Horatio Bridge, is continued. In a paper entitled "Chicago—The Main Exhibit," Julian Ralph gives a graphic and glowing account of the present aspects of business and life in the great metropolis of the lakes. In the department of fiction this number offers the following unexampled attractions: the new play by Amélie Rives, "Athelwold," a tragedy in five acts, beautifully illustrated by Mary L. Gow; "The Little Maid at the Door," a story of the New England witchcraft delusion, by Mary E. Wilkins, illustrated by Howard Pyle; "Mārie," another of William McLennan's inimitable French-Canadian sketches, illustrated by C. S. Reinhart; and "Fin de Siècle," a delightfully entertaining character sketch by Robert C. V. Meyers. John Hay contributes a poem, "Night in Venice," which is accompanied by a superb frontispiece illustration drawn by W. T. Smedley. Another charming poem, "The Stone Woman of Eastern Point," is by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. The Editorial Departments are conducted, as usual, by George William Curtis, William Dean Howells and Charles Dudley Warner.

The most timely article in the February Century is the one written by Mr. C. C. Buel, assistant editor of the magazine, which records the results of a personal investigation by him, in behalf of the readers of The Century, into the history, methods, and designs of a just now notorious institution. The title of the paper is "The Degradation of a State; or, The Charitable Career of the Louisiana Lottery." Mr. Buel goes back to the time when the lottery interests of the country were centred in New York City, and shows that the Louisiana Lottery was established for the benefit of New York gamblers and lottery dealers. The article describes the people who have been the chief beneficiaries of this extensive gambling institution, and exposes the methods of bribery and political corruption by which the franchise was obtained, is maintained, and, as is now feared, is to be extended. This number is also made notable by a posthumous story by Wolcott Ballestier, who is the co-author with Mr. Kipling of "The Naulahka." "Reffey" is novel in plot and situation, the principal characters being a conductor on a far Western railroad, and two young women, one the manager of an eating-house, and the other a telegraph operator. Mr. Balestier's friends consider this story a justification of the high hopes that were entertained for the future of this brilliant writer. Captain Francis V. Greene, late of the regular army, who now holds a commission as major in the militia, contributes an important illustrated paper on "The New National Guard;" and in "Open Letters" General A. V. Kautz offers a plan of making the regular army serve as a school for officers of volunteers with a view to the national defence; Lieutenant R. K. Evans puts in a plea for "A National Militia." In the same number "The Naulahka" is continued, also Dr. S. Weir Mitchell's "Characteristics," the text being enriched by some original poems. and there are short stories by Mrs. Burt on Harrison, author of "The Anglomaniacs," and by the new Southern writer, Mrs. Virginia Frazer Boyle Apropos of Washington's Birthday, Mr. Charles Henry Hart, of Philadelphia, has an illustrated paper giving hitherto unpublished portraits of General and Mrs. Washington, and Nelly Custis. A most notable paper, by Edward Atkinson, on "The Australian Registry of Land Titles," will doubtless help forward a needed reform which seems to have made a start in this country. "Recent Discoveries Concerning the Gulf Stream," by J. E. Pillsbury, is a very fresh, curious, and valuable contribution to an old subject. In a profusely illustrated article on "Pioneer Days in San Francisco," Dr. John Williamson Palmer, the well-known writer, describes, from personal knowledge, the adventurous life and diverse types that lent romantic color to the origin and growth of the metropolis of the West. Dr Wheatley's concluding paper on "The Jews in New York" is strikingly illustrated by a group of five artists, and contains information on this very timely and interesting subject never before gathered together. The famous "Bella," by Titian, engraved from the original by T. Cole, furnishes the frontispiece of this number of The Century, and calls attention anew to the fact that the Cole pictures are now at their most interesting point, having reached the most splendid period of Italian art. American art is interestingly represented by a full-page engraving of Brush's "Killing the Moose." There are poems by Frank Dempster Sherman, Clinton Scollard, Richard E. Burton, Bessie Chandler, Katharine Lee Bates, Charles J. O'Malley, and others. In "Topics of the Time" are editorials entitled "Will an American State be Guilty of Suicide?" "A 'Cheap-Money' Hand-Book," and "The Metropolitan Museum."

The contents of Scribner's Magazine for February are as follows: A Portrait, frontispiece (see American Illustration of To-day), from a pastel by William M. Chase; "Station Life in Australia," by Sidney Dickinson, drawings by Birge Harrison, engraving by Van Ness, Schüssler, Peckwell, and M. J. Whaley; "The Wrecker," Chapters xvi.-xvii., by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne (begun in August, 1891—to be continued), with a full-page illustration by W. L. Metcalf; "A Model Working-Girls' Club," by Albert Shaw, drawings by W. L. Taylor, engraving by E. H. Del'Orme; "If It Could Be!" by Octave Thanet; "Illusions of Memory," by William H. Burnham; "American Illustration of To-day," second paper, by William A. Coffin, with examples of the work of Robert Blum, H. Siddons Mowbray, Irving R. Wiles, H. Bolton Jones, Bruce Crane, F. D. Millet, E. H. Blashfield, J. H. Twachtman and Theodore Robinson; "Asleep upon the Grass," by Eliza Woodworth, with a drawing by Wyatt Eaton; "The Revenue-Cutter Service," I. Its Work in the Relief of Vessels in Distress, by Percy W. Thompson, Lieut. U. S. R. M.; II. Some Typical Rescues by the Revenue Cutters, by Samuel A. Wood, with drawing by W. B. Styles, engraving by C. I. Butler; "So it is True," by Rose Hawthorne Lathrop; "Washington Allston as a Painter," unpublished reminiscences of Henry Greenough, with engravings from paintings by Allston; "An Adventure in Philanthropy," by Edwin C. Martin; "The Arctic Highlander," by Benjamin Sharp, Ph.D., with drawings by O. H. Bacher and J. H. Twachtman, engraving by M. J. Whaley; "The Complete Dutch Kitchen-Maid," a picture of Holland a century and a half ago, by Cornelia J. Chadwick; "Comfort of the Fields," by Archibald Lampman; "The Commonest

Possible Story," by Bliss Perry; "The Point of View"—The Dangers of Comfort, Laughter and Democracy, The Mysteries of Life, Browning in the Future.

THE COSMOPOLITAN MAGAZINE for January has the following contents: Frontispiece, "Columbus;" "The Columbus Portraits," illustrated, William Eleroy Curtis; "The Salon," illustrated by the author, M. Riccardo Nobili; "Aluminium—the Metal of the Future," illustrated, Joseph W. Richards; "In Camp with Stanley," illustrated by George Wharton Edwards, and from drawings made on the spot, A. I. Mounteney Jephson; "Refuge," poem, George Macdonald; "A Daughter of the South," illustrated by Wilson De Meza, Mrs. Burton Harrison; "A March Day," poem, Archibald Lampman; "Old New York," illustrated, James Grant Wilson; "Humpty Dumpty," illustrated from photographs by H. C. Edwards, Adam Bede; "Sun Shadows," poem, Ella Wheeler Wilcox; "What Say ye, Women, to This?" illustrated by "Chip," Will J. Lampton; "The Kansas Railroad Commission," Albert R. Greene; "Old Time Magazines," illustrated, Frank H. T. Bellew; "The Special Correspondents at Washington," illustrated, T. C. Crawford; "Fencing and Fencers in Paris," illustrated by Kendall, Charles De Kay; Current Events, Murat Halsted: "Social Problems," Edward Everett Hale; "About Beautiful Books," Brander Matthews; and for February: Frontispiece, "William Dean Howells;" "Love and Marriage in Japan," illustrated by Wilson De Meza and W. Pelham, Sir Edwin Arnold; "The Petroleum Industry," illustrated, Peter MacQueen; "The Columbus Portraits," illustrated, William Eleroy Curtis; "Leading Amateurs in Photography," illustrated, Clarence Bloomfield Moore; "Peppered by Afghans," illustrated by R. F. Zogbaum, Archibald Forbes; "Relation of Invention to Conditions of Life," illustrated, George H. Knight; "The Rise and Fall of Fonseca," illustrated, Robert Adams, Jr.; "Destiny," poem, Alice I. Eaton; "De Juventure," illustrated by F. G. Attwood, Daniel Coit Gilman; "Safe," poem, Belle Willey Gue; "Pets and Sports of a Farmer Boy," illustrated by D. C. Beard, Murat Halstead: "Trailing Yew," illustrated by C. R. Grant, Patience Stapleton; "Ave! Nero, Imperator," poem, Duffield Osborne; "In a Dove Cote," poem, illustrated by L. W. Ziegler, C. H. Crandall; "Mr. Howells and his Work," H. H. Boyesen; "Social Problems," Edward Everett Hale; "About Books of Reference," Brander Matthews.

PROFESSOR LANCIANI's paper on "The Pageant at Rome in the year 17 B. C." has the foremost place in the ATLANTIC MONTHLY for February. It is devoted to an account of the public games held in Rome seventeen years before Christ, and instituted under the patronage of Augustus, the Senate, and the College of the Quindecimviri. Most important evidences of these games have been lately discovered in Rome; and these having come under Professor Lanciani's eye, he has reconstructed an account of the games and also given a description of the important discoveries lately made, which is of the highest interest not only to archæologists, but to the general reader. Writing of Rome reminds us of Mr. Crawford's second instalment of "Don Orsino," which gives incidentally an idea of the mania for speculation and building lately rife in Rome, and contains a vivid description of the Pope assisting at a service at St. Peter's. Another subject, still Italian, is "A Venetian Printer-Publisher in the Sixteenth Century," the printer-publisher in question being Gabriele Giolito, the chief of a firm of printers and booksellers, who flourished in Venice during a large part of the sixteenth century. Venice is also the scene of a charming little sketch called "The Descendant of the Doges," by Harriet Lewis Bradley. Isabel F. Hapgood, who showed us "Count Tolstóy at Home," in a recent number of the ATLANTIC, has an article on "A Journey on the Volga," a graphic sketch of Russian life. Henrietta Channing Dana discusses "What French Girls Study," and gives a very sympathetic picture of the life of a French school and the kind of training which French girls receive in it. Professor N. S. Shaler, of Harvard University, a Kentuckian by birth, writes with knowledge on "The Border State Men of the Civil War," an interesting pendent to the paper by Professor Gildersleeve in the last number of the ATLANTIC. Profesor Gildersleeve, it will be remembered, decided for the Southern cause; Professor Shaler, in this article, gives his reasons for unhesitating fidelity to the Northern side in the civil war. Professor E. P. Evans writes about "The Nearness of Animals to Men," and Mr. Albert H. Tolman devotes an able paper to "Studies in Macbeth." A discussion of "The League as a Political Instrument," and reviews of a dozen or more volumes of recent fiction, under the title of "The Short Story," complete a number well composed and thoroughly worth reading.

LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for February has the following contents: Frontispiece (portrait of Mrs. M. E. W. Sherwood); "Roy the Royalist," by William Westall; "The Managing Editor" (The Journalist Series), by Julius Chambers; "February," by Louise Chandler Moulton; "The Hackney-Horse" (interview with Dr. R. S. Huidekoper), by Louis N. Megargee; "Across the Sea," by Philip Bourke Marston; "Secretary Rusk's Crusade," by Julian Hawthorne; "Sonnet," by Elizabeth Carpenter; "The Board of Trade and the Farmer," by Henry Clews; "The Ambassador," by Charles Converse Tyler; "Jermyn's Portrait," by Clara Lanza; "Days of my Youth," by St. George Tucker; "Swimming" (Athletic Series), by Hermann Oelrichs; "Prince Gallitzin, Priest and Pioneer," by Hester Dorsey Richardson; "Since the Beginning," by Kate Putnam Osgood; "Recollections," by Mrs. M. E. W. Sherwood; "Intangible," by Kate B. Lathrop; "The English Sparrow," by Mary Isabella Forsyth; "Names vs. Initials," by Jane de Forest Shelton; "As it Seems;" "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading artists).

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Abbott, T. K. Essays, Chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments. London: Longmans, 1891. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Alexander (Bishop of Derry). Verbum Crucis: being ten Sermons on the Mystery and the Words of the Cross, to which are added some other sermons preached on public occasions. London: Low, 1891. Pp. 198, p. 8vo, 3s 6d.

Annales ecclésiastiques, pour faire suite à l'histoire universelle de l'eglise catholique par Rohrbacher, continuée sous forme d'annales, de 1846 à 1868 par J. Chantrel, et de 1869 à 1889 par dom Chamard, prieur des Bénédictins de Saint Maur. (Années 1869–1870.) Fascicule 2. Paris: Gaume, 1891. Pp. 161–320 8vo.

Bachmann, Johs, Dr. Praeparation und Commentar zur Genesis. 2. Heft. Cap. xii–xxiii. Berlin: Mayer, 1891. Pp. iii., 51–97, 8vo, 80 pf.

Bamberger, M. L. Kommentar des Rabbi Joseph Nachmias zum Buche Esther, zum ersten Male herausgegeben nach einer Handschrift des Königlichen Hof-und Staatsbibliothek München mit Emendationen, Quellennachweisen und Anmerkungen. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1891. Pp. 23, 31, 8vo, 2 mk.

Baring-Gould, S., Rev. The Church in Germany. London: Gardner; New York: Pott, 1891. Pp. 416, p. 8vo, cloth, 6 s., $2.00.

Barron, L. La Raison et la Foi. Solution des deux grand problèmes qui ont pour but de concilier la raison avec la raison et la raison avec la foi. 2e fascicule. Lagny: Colin, 1891. Pp. 152, 8vo.

Bate, G. How did Christianity and the Gospels Originate? An answer for minds perplexed with difficulties. London: Simpkin, 1891. Pp. 186, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Beet, J. A. The Firm Foundation of the Christian Faith: a Handbook of Christian Evidences for Sunday-School Teachers. London: Wesl. Meth. S. S. Union, 1891. Pp. 124, 16mo, 1s.

Ben-Oliel, M. M. Prophecy: an Evidence of Inspiration. London: Griffith, 1891. Cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Berendt, Martin, und Friedländer, Jul., D.D. Spinoza's Erkenntnisslehre in ihrer Beziehung zur modernen Naturwissenschaft und Philosophie. Allgemein verständlich dargestellt. Berlin: Mayer, 1891. Pp. xix., 315, 8vo, 5 mk.

Bernardini à Piconio, O., Prof. Triplex expositio beate Pauli apostoli epistolæ ad Romanos; analysi, qua textus apostolici ordo et connexion declaratur; paraphrasi qua mens apostoli breviter exponitur et dare; commentario, quo litterales notæ, variæ lectiones sensusque textui conformiores afferentur. Accedunt et observationes dogmaticæ, morales et asceticæ, pastorales per totum commentarium dispersæ et in corollario pietatis vel doctri post singula capita collectæ. Ad usum studiosorum sanctæ theologiæ et sacerdotum in vinea domini laborantium emendata et aucta per P. Michaelem Hetzenauer. Innsbruck: Buchhandlung, 1891. Pp. 603, 8vo, 9.60 mk.

Berthe, Père. Récits bibliques. Job. Neuville: Duquat, 1891. Pp. 64, 18mo.

Bittkau, G. Die Einführung der Reformation in Neu-Ruppin. Neu-Ruppin: Petrenz, 1891. Pp. 54, 8vo, 50 pf.

Block, Maurice. Le Socialisme moderne. Paris: Hachette, 1891. Pp. 202, 18mo, 1.25 fr.

Boardman, George Nye. Regeneration. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 126, appendix, 12mo, 75 cts.

Bocock, John H., D.D. Selections from the Religious and Literary Writings of ——; with a biographical sketch of C. R. Vaughan, D.D.; edited by his widow. Richmond, Va.; Whittet, 1891. Pp. xxvi., 644, 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

Bolton, Sarah R. Famous Artists: Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Titian, Murillo, Rubens, Rembrandt. London: Nelson, 1891. Pp. 344, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Bournand, François. Trois artistes Chrétiens: Michel Ange, Raphaël et Hip. Flandrin. Preface par M. L. Ov. Scribe. Paris et Lyon: Delhomme, 1891. Pp. 384, 8vo.

Brimmer, Martin. Egypt. Three Essays on the History, Religion, and Art of Ancient Egypt. Boston: Houghton, 1892. Pp. viii., 86, 8vo, cloth, $5.00.

Bristol, S. The Pioneer Preacher: an autobiography. Introduction by Rev. J. H. Fairchild. London: Wheeler, 1891. Pp. 326, 3s 6d.

Browning, Oscar. Dante, his Life and Writings. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. vii., 104, 12mo, 90 cts.

Carrier, Augustus S. The Hebrew Verb: a series of tabular studies. Chicago: Stern, 1892. Pp. 33, 8vo.

Carter, R. Kelso, Capt., and Simpson, A.B., Rev. (Ed's.) Hymns of the Christian Life. New and standard songs for the sanctuary, Sunday-Schools, prayer meetings, mission work and revival services. New York: Chr. All. Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. 320, 8vo.

Chase, Frederic. A History of Dartmouth College and the town of Hanover, N. H., edited by John K. Lord. Vol. I. Cambridge: Wilson, 1891. Pp. 694, 8vo, cloth, $3.50.

Chase, Frederic. A History of Dartmouth College and the town of Hanovor, N. H.; edited by John K. Lord. Vol. I. Cambridge: Wilson, 1891. Pp. 694, 8vo, cloth, $3.50.

Christlieb, Theodor (of Bonn). Memoir, by his widow; and Sermons, chiefly by T. L. Kingsbury and Samuel Garratt. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 458, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Church, Alfred J., Rev. Stories from the Bible. Second series. New York: Macmillan, 1891. $1.25. (See bibliography for January.)

Clarke, James Freeman. The Lord's Prayer. Being the last eight discourses of ——. Boston: Am. Unit. Ass., 1892. Pp. ii., 95, 16mo, 50 cts.

Claverie, Maurice. Immoralité de la morale chrétienne. Préface par Edmond Lepelletier. Paris: Richard, 1891. Pp. v., 51, 16mo, 50 cts.

Clemen, A. Ueber den Gebrauch des Alten Testaments im Neuen Testament und speciell in den Reden Jesu. Grimma: Gensel, 1891. Pp. 17, 4to, 1 mk.

Coltman, Robert, Jr., M.D. The Chinese: their present and future; medical, political and social. Philadelphia: Davis, 1891. Pp. 218, 8vo, cloth, $1.75.

Crushed, Yet Conquering: a story of Constance and Bohemia. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. iii., 584, 8vo, $2.00.

Corroyer, Edouard. L'Architecture Gothique. Paris: May, 1891. Pp. 383, 8vo.

Darkest England. Social Scheme: a brief review of the first year's work. London: Office, 1891. Pp. 156, 8vo, 1s.

Days of Queen Mary, The; or, annals of her reign, containing particulars of the Restoration of Romanism, and the suffering of the martyrs during that period. New edition. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. xiv., 382, 12mo, $1.00.

Denney, J. The Epistles to the Thessalonians. (Expositor's Bible.) London: Hodder; New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. 402, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d., $1.50.

Didon, Père. Jesus Christ, our Saviour's Person, Mission, and Spirit; from the French by Bernard O'Reilly, D.D.; with introduction by James, Cardinal Gibbons. 2 vols. London: Paul; New York: Appleton, 1891. Pp. lxxxiii., 490; vi., 481, 8vo, cloth, 31s. 6d., $7.50.

Dilmann, Ed. Eine neue Darstellung der Leibnizischen Monadenlehre auf Grund der Quellen. Leipzig: Reisland, 1891. Pp. x., 525, 8vo, 10 mk.

Dörries, B. Erklärung des Kleinen Katechismus Dr. M Luthers. Ein Beitrag zur Reform des Katechismusunterrichts. 1. Theil. Der Glaube. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891. Pp. vi., 312, 8vo, 4 mk.

Drummond, Henry. Beautiful Thoughts from ——; selected and arranged for every-day reading, by Elizabeth Cureton. New York: Pott, 1891. 18mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Duff, A. Old Testament Theology: or, the history of Hebrew religion, from the year 800 B.C. From 800 B.C. to Josiah, 640 B.C. London: Black, 1891. Pp. 350, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Earthly Footprints of our Lord Illumined. A continuous narrative of the four Gospels according to the Revised Version. With an introduction by the Rev. John Hall, D.D. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 450, 12mo, $1.50.

Ellicott (Bishop of Gloucester). Christus Comprobator; or, the Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament. Seven addresses. London: S. P. C. K., 1891. Pp. 214, 12mo, 2s.

Elliott, Walter, Rev. The Life of Father Hecker. New York: Col. Press, 1891. Pp. xvi., 428, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Ellis, James J., Rev. Charles Haddon Spurgeon. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. vii., 219, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Feine, P. Eine vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte. Eine Untersuchung. Gotha: Perthes, 1891. Pp. x., 252, 8vo, 4 mk.

Figg, E. G. Analysis of Theology, Natural and Revealed. An essay, contrasting the pretensions of religion and of atheism to scientific truth. London: Williams & N., 1891. Pp. 542, p. 8vo, 6s.

First Doctrine of the Primitive Church, The. Letters and addresses from a few eminent advocates of the Scriptural theology of conditional immortality. Read before a convention of the Young Ministers' Christian Union of the United States of America, with a publisher's preface. Providence: Snow, 1892. Pp. xviii., 74, 16mo, 50 cts.

Fox, A. The Judges and Kings of Israel. For the young. London: Simpkin, 1891. Pp. 226, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Fürst, A., Dr. Christen und Juden. Licht und Schatten bilder aus Kirche und Synagoge. Strassburg i. E.: Verlagsanstalt, 1891. Pp. iv., 316, 8vo, 3mk.

Garratt, S. Rest, Conflict, Victory; or, Lights and Shadows of the Inward Life. London: Hunt, 1891. Pp. 148, 16mo, 1s. 6d.

Garrison, J. H. Alone with God. A manual of devotions. Being a series of meditations, with forms of prayer. St. Louis: Chr. Pub. Co., 1892. Pp. xiv., 242, 16mo, 75 cts. [Also] The Old Faith Restated. Being a restatement, by representative men, of the fundamental truths and essential doctrines of Christianity, as held and advocated by the Disciples of Christ in the light of experience and of Biblical research. Edited by—. The same. Pp. 456, 8vo, $2.00.

Gell, L., Hon. Mrs. The Cloud of Witness. A daily sequence of great thoughts from many minds, following the Christian seasons. London: Frowde, 1891. Pp. 566, 18mo, 3s. 6d.

Gerhart, R. Leighton, Rev. The Young Prophetess. A tale of the Children's Crusade. Philadelphia: Ref. Ch. Pub. House, 1891. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Gestefeld, Ursula N. A Chicago Bible Class. New York: U. S. Bk. Co., 1891. Pp. v., 305, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Gilbert, Alfred N. Standard Eclectic Commentary on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1892; with Geographical Notes by J. W. McGarvey. Cincinnati: Stand. Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. viii., 256, 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

Goulburn, E. M. John William Burgon: a Biography. With extracts from his letters and early journals. With portrait. London: Murray, 1891. 2 vols. Pp. 768, p. 8vo, 24s.

Hall, Charles Cuthbert, D.D. Into His Marvellous Light: Studies in Light and Belief. Boston, Houghton, 1891. Pp. iii., 354, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Harris, Helen B. The Newly Recovered Apology of Aristides: its Doctrine and Ethics. With extracts from the translation by Prof. J. Rendel Harris, with frontispiece. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 104, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Hawthorne, J. B., D.D. Paul and the Women, and other Discourses. Louisville: Bapt. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. iv., 151, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Hecker, I. T. Church and the Age: Exposition of the Catholic Church. New York: Col. Press, 1891. 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Heidrich, R. Handbuch für den Religionsunterricht in den oberen Klassen. 3. Theil. Glaubenslehre. Berlin: Heine, 1891. Pp. xii., 254, 8vo, 5.20 mk.

Hemenway, F. D., D.D., and Stuart, Charles M., B.D. Gospel Singers and their Songs. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. 195, 12mo, 80 cts.

Hobson, John P., M. A. The Love of Christ: His to us, ours to Him. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 143. 12mo, 40 cts.

Inglis, Charles. Pegs for Preachers: Points for Workers. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 146, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Jaurès, J. De primis socialismi germanici lineamentis apud Lutherum, Kant, Fichte et Hegel. Thesim proponebat. Toulouse: Chauvin, 1891. Pp. 90, 8vo.

Jean, Armand. Les Evêques et Archevêques de France depuis 1682 jusqu'à 1801. Paris: Piard, 1891. Pp. xxvi., 544, 8vo.

Johnson, G. B. The Beautiful Life of Christ, and Other Studies. London: Alexander, 1891. Pp. 330, p. 8vo, 5s.

Kannengiesser, P. Der Reichstag zu Worms vom Jahre 1545. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Schmalkaldischen Krieges. Strassburg i. E.: Heitz, 1891. Pp. vii., 131, 8vo, 3 mk.

Kirby, Archbishop (of Ephesus). Meditations on the Truths of Religion and on the Hidden and Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. Dublin: Gill, 1891. Pp. 382, 12mo, 4s.

Kirkpatrick, A. F., B.D. The Divine Library of the Old Testament. London and New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. xviii., 155, 12mo, cloth, 3s., $1.00.

Knox, M. V. B., Rev., Ph.D., D.D. A Winter in India and Malaysia among the Methodist Missions. With an Introduction by Bishop John F. Hurst, D.D., LL.D. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. ii., 306, 12mo, $1.20.

Langhans, Eduard. Ein Zeuge der Geistesfreiheit. Aufsätze-Vorträge—Reisebriefe. Mit Lebensbeschreibung und Bildniss. Bern: Schmid, 1891. Pp. xlii., 358, 8vo, 3.20 mk.

Lechner, A. Mittelalterliche Kirchenfeste und Kalendarien in Bayern. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. viii., 287, 8vo, 6 mk.

Lichtenstein, J. Judenthum und Christenthum. Hamburg: Scheibenhuber, 1891. Pp. vii., 97, 8vo, 1.75 mk.

Liddon, Henry P., D.D., D.C.L. Sermons on Old Testament Subjects. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. xiv., 379, 12mo, $2.00.

Lilley, J. P. The Lord's Day and the Lord's Servants: a Contribution to Pastoral Theology. Edinburgh: Thin, 1891. Pp. 296, p. 8vo, 1s.

Living Church Quarterly, The. Containing an Almanac and Calendar for 1892. Milwaukee: Y. Churchman Co., 1891. Pp. 328, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

Love and Forgiveness. Reflections suggested by "The Greatest Thing in the World." From the German. Boston: Little, 1891. Pp. ii., 48, 12mo, 35 cts.

Lyons, Daniel, Rev. Christianity and Infallibility—Both or Neither. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. ix., 254, 12mo, $1.50.

McCarthy, J. Hendrickson, Rev. Fact and Fiction in Holy Writ; or, Book and World Wonders. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. 348, 12mo, $1.00.

Macmillan, Hugh, Rev., LL.D. The Gate Beautiful, and other Bible Readings for the Young. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. vii., 284, 12mo, $1.25.

McPherson, J. H. T. History of Liberia. (Johns Hopkins University Studies, series 9, No. 10.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1891. Pp. ii., 61, 8vo, paper, 50 cts.

Mandel, Thdr. Heinrich, Pfarrer. Die Vorgeschichte der öffentlichen Wirksamkeit Jesu, nach den evangelischen Quellen entworfen. Berlin: Reuther, 1892. Pp. viii., 358, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Mason, A. J. The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism as Taught in Holy Scripture and the Fathers. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 520, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Matson, William A., D.D. The Adversary: His Person, Power and Purpose. A study in Satanology. New York; Ketcham, 1891. Pp. xi., 238, 12mo, $1.25.

Maurice, F. D. Sermons Preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel. New ed., 6 vols. Vol. 3. London: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 280, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Meyrick, Frederic, Rev. The Church in Spain. New York: Pott, 1891. 8vo, cloth, $2.00.

Michie, A. Missionaries in China. London: Stanford, 1891. Pp 110, 8vo, 3s. 6d. (An essay from a religious and political standpoint.)

Mikkelsen, Michael A. The Bishop Hill Colony: A Religious Communistic Settlement in Henry County, Illinois. (Johns Hopkins University Studies, 10th series, No. 1.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1892. Pp. ii., 80, 8vo, paper, 50 cts.

Miller, William Haig. The Great Rest-Giver. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 224, 12mo, $1.00.

Moir, Jane F. A Lady's Letters from Central Africa. A journal from Mandala, Shire Highlands, to Ujiji, Lake Tanganyika and back. With introduction by Rev. T. M. Lindsay. New York: Macmillan, 1891. 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Moldenke, Charles E. The New York Obelisk: Cleopatra's Needle. With a preliminary sketch of the history, erection, uses, and signification of obelisks. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. vii., 202, 8vo, cloth, $2 00.

Mühe, E. Prophetische Epistelpredigten über Seitenstücke zu den Episteln aus den Propheten und den Lehrbüchern des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: Böhme, 1891. Pp. xiii., 446, 8vo, 5 mk.

Mullen, Tobias (Roman Catholic Bishop of Erie). The Canon of the Old Testament. New York: Pustet, 1892. Pp. xxiv., 664, 8vo.

New Creation, The. By the author of "Our Family Ways." Milwaukee: Y. Churchman Co., 1892. Pp. ii., 128, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts. (A study of the Incarnation.)

Odell, Samuel W. Delilah: A Sequel to "Samson." Cincinnati: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1892. Pp. ii., 207, 12mo, 75 cts.

Oliphant, Mrs. Jerusalem. The Holy City, its history and hope. With wood engravings from drawings by Hamilton Aïde, and photographs by F. M. Good. London and New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. xxv., 557, 12mo, 21s., $3.00.

Oxenden, Ashton, Bishop. The History of My Life. An autobiography. London and New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 260, p. 8vo, cloth, 5s., $1.75.

Parker, William H., Rev. The Psalmody of the Church, its Authors, Singers, and Uses. With index of topics, names, and hymns. New York; Revell, 1892. Pp. 269, 4to, cloth, $1.50.

Pastor, Ludwig, Prof., Dr. The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. Edited by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus. (Catholic Standard Library.) London: Hodges, 1891. 2 vols., 8vo, 24s.

Pearson, Charles W. Methodism: A Retrospect and an Outlook. (A poem.) New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. ii., 86, 12mo, cloth, 30 cts.

Pepper, J. R. The Modern Sunday-School Superintendent and his Work. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 32, 16mo, 15 cts.

Percival, Henry R., M.A. The Doctrine of the Episcopal Church, so far as it is set forth in the Prayer-Book. Digested and arranged. New York: Putnams, 1891. Pp. vi., 103, 12mo, 75 cts.

Pickford, Alice T. Step by Step; or, The Lord's Leading. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 192, 12mo, cloth, 90 cts.

Pierson, Arthur T. The Miracles of Missions; or, The Modern Marvels in the History of Missionary Enterprise. New York: Funk & W., 1891. Pp. viii., 193, 12mo.

Popley, W. A. Christ the Creator and Redeemer of Mankind, and God, the Christian's Father. London: Stock, 1891. Cr. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Potter, Henry C., D.D. Waymarks, 1870–1891. Being discourses, with some account of their occasions. New York: Dutton, 1891. Pp. vi., 383, 12mo, cloth, $1.75.

Protestant Episcopal Church. Papers, Addresses and Discussions at the Fourteenth Church Congress in the United States, held in Washington, D. C., Nov. 17–20, 1891. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. viii., 198, 8vo, $1.00.

Queruan-Lamerie, E. L'Eglise constitutionelle du département de la Mayenne après la Terreur, d'après la correspondance de Ch. Fr. d'Orlodot. Angers: Germain, 1891. Pp. 71, 8vo.

Reuss, R. Zum Gedächtnisse Martin Butzers, des Strassburger Reformators. Rede. Strassburg i. E.: Heitz, 1891. Pp. 30, 8vo, 20 pf.

Robertson, W. B. Martin Luther. German student life; poetry. From the manuscripts of the late——. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1891. Pp. 210, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Robinson, L. L., Miss. Systematic Bible Study for Advanced Classes. Milwaukee: Y. Churchman Co., 1892. Pp. 170, 16mo, 20 cts.

Ross, D. M. The Cradle of Christianity. Chapters on modern Palestine. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 256, p. 8vo, 5s.

Rotheham, Joseph B. The New Testament. Newly translated and critically emphasized. With an introduction and occasional notes. Indexed. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 492, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Rutherford, Samuel, Rev. Letters. Revised and edited by the Rev. Thomas Smith, D.D.; with a preface by the Rev. Alex. Duff. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 596, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Sanford, A. B., Rev., (ed.) The Methodist Year Book for 1892. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. 133, 12mo, paper, 10 cts.

Schiffini, Sanctus, S. J. Disputationes philosophiæ moralis. Augustæ Taurinorum (Freiburg: Herder), 1891. 2 vols. Pp. 432, 699, 8vo, 9.60 mk. (Inhalt: I. Ethica generalis. II. Ethica specialis.)

Schlatter, D. A. Jason von Kyrene. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Wiederherstellung. München: Beck, 1891. Pp. iii., 55, 8vo, 3 mk.

Schleimer, Alexis. Der Positivismus. Eine kritische Studie. Dissertation. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. 31, 8vo, 80 pf.

Schmidt, Hermann, Prof., Dr. Zur Christologie. Vorträge und Abhandlungen. Berlin: Reuther, 1891. Pp. iii., 222, 8vo, 4 mk.

Schwarz, Hermann, Dr. Das Wahrnehmungsproblem vom Standpunkte des Physikers, der Physiologen und der Philosophen Beiträge zur Erkenntnisstheorie und empirischer Psychologie. Leipzig: Duncker, 1892. Pp. xxi., 408, 8vo, 9 mk.

Sermon Year Book and Selected Sermons for 1891. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 416, p. 8vo, 6s. (Sermons and outlines by leading English Churchmen and Dissenters.)

Smyth, Julius K., Rev. Holy Names. As interpretations of the story of the Manger and the Cross. Boston: Robinson, 1891. Pp. 203, 12mo, $1.00.

Stannard, J. T. The Divine Humanity, and Other Sermons. Edited by Rev. John Hunter. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1891. Pp. 232, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Stanton, V. H. The Places of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 230, p. 8vo, 6s.

Stern, E. Martin Butzer. Ein Lebensbild aus der Geschichte der Strassburger Reformation. Strassburg i. E.: Verlagsanstalt, 1891. Pp. 87, 8vo, 50 pf.

(**Sturm,** August, Dr.) Der alte und der neue Glaube. Von einem Juristen. Halle: Mühlmann, 1891. Pp. vii., 62, 8vo, 1 mk.

Thomæ Kempensis de imitatione Christi libri IV. Textum ex autographo Thomæ nunc primum accuratissime reddidit, distinxit, novo modo disposuit; capitulorum et librorum argumenta, locos parallelos adjecit C. Hirsche. Ed. II. Berlin: Habel, 1891. Pp. xlviii., 376, 8vo, 4 mk.

Townsend, L. T., Prof., D.D. Bible Miracles and Modern Thought. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. 48, 12mo, 15 cts.

Trumbull, Henry Clay. Friendship the Master-Passion; or, the Nature and History of Friendship and its Place as a Force in the World. Philadelphia: Wattles, 1892. Pp. 413 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

Tyndall, C. H., Rev. Object Sermons in Outline. Introduction by Rev. A. F. Schauffler, D.D., with numerous illustrations. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 254, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Universal Register, 1892. Boston: Universalist Pub. House, 1892. Pp. 112, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.

Vaughan, C. J. The Prayers of Jesus Christ. A closing series of Lent Lectures delivered in the Temple Church. London: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 124, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Vickers, J. The Real Jesus. A review of His life, character, and death from a Jewish standpoint. Addressed to members of the Theistic Church. London: Williams, 1891. Pp. 350, p. 8vo, 6s.

Wallace, C. J. The Analogy of Existence and Christianity. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 308, p. 8vo, 6s.

Watson, George D., D.D. Love Abounding, and other Expositions on the Spiritual Life. Boston and Chicago: McDonald, 1891. Pp. v., 408, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Weill, Ernst, Dr. Der Commentar des Maimonides zum Tractat Berachoth. Arabischer Text mit hebräischer Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen. Berlin: Mayer, 1891. Pp. 33, 38, 8vo, 2 mk.

Wellhausen, J. Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah. 3d ed. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 229, 12mo, cloth, $2.00.

Wells, J., Rev. Bible Object-Lessons. Addresses to the Young. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 240, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Williams, G. Mott, Rev. The Old Theology and the New. A sermon, delivered at the close of his ministry as Dean of All Soul's Cathedral, Milwaukee. Milwaukee: Y. Churchman Co., 1892. Pp. 17, 12mo, paper, 10 cts.

Wilms, W. Vernunft und Glaube. Eine Kritik der herrschenden Religion vom Standpunkte der Laien. Zürich: Verlagsmagazin, 1891. Pp. 77, 8vo, 60 pf.

Witte, Mme. de (*née* Guizot). La Charité en France à travers les siècles. Paris: Hachette, 1891. Pp. 435, 8vo, 7 fr.

Worms, R. La morale de Spinoza; examen de ses principes et de l'influence qu'elle a exercée dans les temps modernes. Paris: 1891. Sm. 8vo, (3s. 6d.)

Younghusband, Frances. The Story of the Exodus. Being Part 2 of "The Story of the Bible." London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 156, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Zeidler, V. Der Sünden Widerstreit. Eine geistliche Dichtung des 13. Jahrhunderts. Herausgegeben. Graz: Styria, 1891. Pp. 114, 8vo, 3.40 mk.

CHRONICLE.

(*Closes on the 20th of each month.*)

Dec. 18—21. Second meeting of the Institute of Sacred Literature, at Chicago. A University Extension scheme for Bible study was discussed.

Dec. 19. A gift of property valued at $150,000 was accepted for the site of the Washington, D. C., Protestant Episcopal Cathedral. The donors are Francis G. Newlands and H. Peirce Waggaman.

Dec. 22. First annual meeting of the United Christian Commission at Washington. This is to promote the spiritual interests of the army and navy.

Dec. 29. Meeting of college presidents under the auspices and in the interests of the Young Men's Christian Association, in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dec. 29—30. Fourth annual meeting of the American Society of Church History, in Washington, D. C. Many valuable papers were presented. One of the most important announcements made was that arrangements had been made for the compilation, by eminent scholars, of a series of denominational histories. The Rev. Professor Newman, of Toronto, will write the Baptist History; Professor Williston Walker, of Hartford, the Congregational; Professor H. E. Jacobs, the Lutheran; the Rev. Dr. Buckley, the Methodist; Professor Thompson, of the University of Pennsylvania, the Presbyterian; the Rev. Dr. Tiffany, the Protestant Episcopal; Professor Thomas O'Gorman, of the Catholic University of Washington, the Roman Catholic; Professor J. H. Allen, the Unitarian; Rev. Richard Eddy, the Universalist; Professor J. H. Dubbs, of Lancaster, Pa., the Reformed German; Dr. Corwin, of New Brunswick, N. J., the Dutch Reformed; Professor Hamilton, of Bethlehem, Pa., the Moravian; and the Rev. B. B. Tyler, that of the Disciples of Christ The other denominations are not yet arranged for. The series will be published by the Christian Literature Company.

Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in Washington. D. C.

Jan. 5. The will of Mrs. Robert L. Stuart was filed for probate. Her property was nearly all left to religious organizations, mainly those connected with the Presbyterian Church. In particular, about $300,000 was left to each of the following interests: The American Bible Society, the Boards of Home and Foreign Missions and of Church Erection of the Presbyterian Church, Lenox Library, the Presbyterian Hospital of New York City, and the Presbyterian Hospital. Besides these, other societies, twenty-six in number, each receive about $80,000.

Jan. 5—7. Third congress of the colored Catholics of the United States at Philadelphia.

Jan. 7—8. Fifth annual convention of the (Episcopal) Church Student's Missionary Association, at Middletown, Conn.

Jan. 10. Reports of the American Delegates to the World's Evangelical Alliance Conference at Florence, Italy, in April, 1891, delivered at the Marble Collegiate Church, New York.

Jan. 12. Reconvention of the Presbyterian General Assembly's Committee on the revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith, in New York City.

Jan. 13—14. Annual meeting of the (Congregational) Woman's Board of Missions, in Brooklyn.

Jan. 20. Thirty-first anniversary of the Woman's Union Missionary Society, at Bible House, New York City.

The Ven. Norman Dumenil John Straton, M.A., Archdeacon of Huddersfield and Vicar of Wakefield, has been elevated to the Bishopric of Sodor and Man, to fill the place of Bishop Bardsley, who was transferred to Carlisle. The appointment and transfer met much adverse criticism.

The first financial echo of the protest against Dr. Briggs comes from the Washington Presbytery. John T. De Sellum, of Rockville, has left $21,000 to Princeton Theological Seminary. He had previously bequeathed the money to Union Theological Seminary, but changed the will subsequent to the passing of a resolution by his Presbytery directed against Professor Briggs.

The Rev. Charles R. Uncles, lately ordained to the priesthood by Cardinal Gibbons, is the first colored man so ordained in the United States.

The New Year has given utterance to increasingly loud protests against the "International Sunday-School Lessons."

The Rev. Dr. Henry Gabriels, President of St. Joseph's Provincial Seminary, Troy, has been appointed by the Pope Bishop of Ogdensburgh.

Two new dioceses are in process of formation in the English Colonial Church: Lebombo, to include Delagoa Bay, and British Honduras.

Mrs. Elizabeth U. Coles, who died Dec. 29th. in New York, has bequeathed a sum estimated at over $200,000 to the Episcopal Cathedral in New York City.

The Rev. John McNeil, the popular London preacher, has resigned his pulpit in Regent Park, in order to join Moody and Sankey in evangelistic work in Scotland.

OBITUARY.

Aiken, Rev. Charles Augustus (Presbyterian), Ph.D. (Princeton, 1866), D.D. (Princeton, 1870), died at Princeton January 14, 1892, aged 64. He was Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary, and was the author of a book on "Ethics" and on "The Historical Books of the Old Testament."

Burr, Rev. Erastus (Episcopalian), D.D. (Kenyon College), died at Portsmouth, O., December 15, 1891, aged 86.

Childs, Rev. John A. (Episcopalian), D.D., secretary of the diocese of Pennsylvania; died Monday, December 21, 1891, aged 77.

Crowther, Right Rev. Samuel Adjai, D.D. (Colonial Church of England), Bishop of the Niger Territory, died December 31, aged over 70. He was a native African, and was carried off as a slave by Arabs in 1821.

Huidekooper, Professor Alfred (Unitarian), died at Meadville, Pa., January 13, aged 82. He founded the Meadville Theological School.

Judd, Rev. Orrin. Bishop (Baptist), D.D., LL.D., died January 12, 1892, aged 75. He founded the New York *Chronicle*, which he edited for several years.

Legge, Right Rev. Augustus (Church of England), D.D., Bishop of Lichfield, died in London January 7, aged 76.

Loughlin, Right Rev. John (Roman Catholic), D.D., Bishop of Long Island; born in Ireland in December, 1817; came to this country in his twelfth year; was ordained priest 1840; vicar general of the diocese of New York, 1849; bishop of the newly created diocese of Brooklyn, 1852, celebrated the golden jubilee of his priesthood October 18, 1890; died at Brooklyn, N. Y., December 29, 1891, aged 74.

Manning, Cardinal Edward (Roman Catholic), D.D. (Rome, 1854), was born July 15, 1808; graduated at Balliol College, Oxford, 1830; was ordained in the Church of England; became archdeacon of Chichester 1840; became a Romanist 1851; archbishop of Westminster in 1865, and cardinal in 1875; died January 14, 1892. He was connected with the Tractarian movement, and his writings are numerous and influential. Among his most important works are "On the Unity of the Church," "England and Christendom," "Petri Privilegium," "The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost," "Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance" and several volumes of "Sermons."

Marango, John (Roman Catholic), Bishop of Athens and Delegate Apostolic of the Holy See, died December 17, aged 58.

Philpott, Right Rev. Henry (Church of England), late Bishop of Westminster, aged 83.

Reeves, Right Rev. William (Church of Ireland), D.D. (Trinity College, Dublin, 1850), LL.D. (Edinburgh, 1860, and Trinity College, Dublin, 1871), Bishop of Down and Connor since 1886, died January 12, 1892. Among his writings are "The Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down and Connor," "Account of St. Patrick's Bell" and "The Nature, Source and Influence of Contentment."

Simeoni, Cardinal Giovanni, Prefect-General of the Propaganda under the present Pope and Secretary of State under Pius IX., died in Rome January 14, 1892, aged 75.

Skinner, Rev. Thomas H. (Presbyterian), D.D. (Princeton, 1867), Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in McCormick Seminary, Chicago, died January 4, 1892, aged 71. He was called to the chair in 1881.

Thibaudier, Archbishop of Cambrai, born 1823, died at Cambrai January 9, 1892, aged 68. Prior to his elevation to the Archbishopric he was Vicar General of Lyons, Bishop of Sidonia and Bishop of Scissons and Laon.

CALENDAR.

Feb. 2-3. Baptist Winter Missionary Conference at Des Moines.

Feb. 7-12. Baptist Workers' Convention at Nashville.

Feb. 24. Ordination of the Rev. C. K. Nelson (Episcopalian), D.D., Bishop elect of Georgia, at Atlanta.

Mar. 2. "Alliance Day" at all theological seminaries connected with the Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5. MARCH, 1892. No. 6.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

RESCUE MISSION WORK.

BY A. F. SCHAUFFLER, D.D.

First: The Classes Aimed at.—In a broad sense, all mission work is rescue work, for it aims at rescuing men and women from their sins. But what is technically known as "Rescue Mission Work" aims at a particular class. In every large city the population tends to segregate itself into various classes having some affinity for each other. In proportion as the city grows, these classes become more numerous. In addition to this, these classes tend to aggregate themselves in geographical localities, massing themselves in certain parts of the city. For example, the Italians congregate in certain streets; while other streets are given over to Frenchmen, Chinese, Irish, Bohemians, Jews. Again, those who are law-breakers tend to the same general massing, and whole districts are given over to their misrule and criminal operations. Now, in every large city there are of necessity many thousands of men who have no place that they can call "home." These live in lodging-houses, of which there are in New York many scores. Along the Bowery alone there are lodgings for such men, having over seven thousand beds, though, of course, they are not confined to this one street. Probably in the winter season this class numbers over forty thousand in New York; while the number decreases largely in the summer months. Who and what are these men? They come from all classes of society—many of them being men who have drifted to the city in search of work. Having very limited means, they naturally seek cheap lodgings; and these they can find at a price to suit any but those absolutely penniless—for these lodging-houses range anywhere in price from twenty-five cents down to five cents a night. Into this class, too, fall those who have steady work, but who find in the freedom from oversight in the lodging-house a welcome characteristic, enabling them to keep all sorts of hours and associate with all sorts of men and women. They can come and go as suits them; and, provided they pay their fee regularly, no questions are asked. Then there are those formerly of a better class, who have, through dissipation, lost the means of paying for more homelike board, and are pushed down a step in the social grade. Among these are college graduates, physicians, teachers, business clerks, dry-goods runners, and even clergymen and Sunday-school superintendents. Truly, all classes and conditions of men are found here huddled together; some by reason of crime, others because of shiftlessness, again, others because of great miscalculation of their business chances, and yet others simply because the general irresponsibility of this kind of a life has a fascination for them. Of course not all of them are criminal, or even vicious; but it goes without saying that *the tendency* in all of these cases, morally, is not upward, but downward. They nearly all have come to that pass that they live from hand to mouth, and often find themselves in dire straits as to how to raise the few cents needful for their night's lodging or their scanty meal. Impecunious they are, nearly all of them, while many among them have so long been out of regular work, by reason of acquired shiftlessness or drink, that they could not earn an honest day's wages at manual work if it were offered to them.

This is the class at which the rescue mission aims most directly. That it succeeds in reaching it is apparent to any one who steps into almost any of the missions of this description in the city. And not only in this city, but in all cities; for were the visitor transplanted unconsciously from New York to Chicago, and set there in a mission like that from which he had been taken, he would hardly know that he was in a different city. I say these missions succeed in reaching the class at which they aim; but I wish this to be understood as meaning only that they succeed in getting them to attend the meetings, and not that they reach them in any large numbers *spiritually.*

This being the class aimed at, it is, of course, true that the vast majority of them are men. And this is one of the things that will impress one not familiar with such a mission when he visits it for the first time. Here at least there will be no complaint that the female part of the audience outnumbers the male, for the men are there as three to one compared with the women. Sometimes as twenty to one. Indeed, I have conducted such meetings where there were two hundred men and only one woman.

Second: The Methods Used.—These are as uniform as is the class of persons reached. The building where such a mission meets is usually on a popular thoroughfare, so as to catch them as they go past. Generally some store on the ground floor is rented, and the place plainly fitted up with benches, a reader's desk, a cabinet organ, sometimes a railing in front of the leader's platform, where the "anxious" ones can kneel, and Bible mottoes hung all around on the walls. The place is brilliantly lighted, and the door kept ajar, so that passers-by may be able to look in and see what is going on.

Services are always held every evening in the year, beginning at about 7.30 and continuing till there are no more inquirers to be dealt with. The manner of conducting the service is uniform. A leader is selected who has the skill requisite, and he conducts a half hour of "praise service," which means merely the singing of a dozen or so of the most taking hymns, in which the audience always joins *con amore.* While this is going on, passers-by are invited to come in, and generally respond with readiness. Soon the little hall is full, and then the leader announces that it is time to commence the meeting. He reads some appropriate portion of Scripture and offers a short prayer. A hymn or two are then sung, and the leader comments briefly on the passage read. Then come one or two prayers by those who are helpers in the mission, and then the meeting is thrown open to "testimony." This is the signal for those who think they have been saved in the mission to get up and bear witness to their change of life. All are admonished to "be short;" and if any one gives sign that he is beginning to be long, he is pointedly exhorted to "Leave out the beginning and the end of your remarks, and give us the middle." (Not a bad hint, by the by, for some ministers to take.) These testimonies are interspersed with singing and prayer, and all goes briskly till about nine o'clock, when it is time to ask those who wish to reform to rise for prayer or hold up their hand. Here there are times when much urging is needed, but generally there are quite a number of men who at once respond to the invitation. As they do, exclamations of "Bless the Lord!" "Praise God!" are heard from the leader and his supporters. Then the meeting is dismissed, those who have asked for prayer having been previously requested to remain behind for conversation with the workers. This many of them do, though nearly always some go out with the rest of the attendants. These inquirers are then dealt with—sometimes by the leader himself, and sometimes by the other workers—one by one.

Third: The Leader of the Mission.—It is generally the aim of all who start a rescue mission to get as leader a reformed man, who has himself been a drunkard or criminal—this on the theory that it takes a rogue to catch a rogue, or at least a man who has been in the ditch to pick another man out. This is the general rule, though not an absolutely uniform one. In fact, it cannot be universally carried out, for there are not enough reformed men to man all the missions. That such a selection is wise, provided the right man can be found, is sure; for where the leader can repeat the "Blind Man's Creed," and say, "Whereas I was blind, now I see, and it is Jesus who has given me sight," it gives great force to his admonitions. Before him are men who have given up hope for themselves, and if they see a leader who has been in the same condition in which they are at this very moment, and who has been rescued, it gives them courage to make an effort for themselves.

Fourth: Accessories to the Rescue Mission.—No rescue mission that I know of ever stops in the handling of its men at this point. Of course the men who come to the front are nearly all destitute. They need food, raiment, shelter. Whether they *deserve* these things is not now the question. To meet these wants, some of the better-equipped rescue missions have a lodging-house attached to their work, and to this they send such men as they deem worthy, after dealing with them at the inquirer's bench. Generally such missions have friends who send to them their cast-off clothing, and this is distributed to such as are in need of garments. Besides, many meals are given out, either on the premises or through arrangement with some cheap restaurant in the neighborhood. Sometimes a labor bureau is added to the other instrumentalities at work, the aim being to supply all the wants of the inquirer, and if possible to set him on his feet again, so that he shall be able to earn his own living. In some missions free meals are given to *all* who come to certain meetings, as, say, Saturday evening or Sunday morning. At these meetings all who come are fed and no questions are asked. At the close of this repast a meeting is held, and comity obliges all who have eaten to remain. A notable gathering of this kind is the "Free Breakfast" in Edinburgh, where hundreds of men, women, and children are fed and then preached to every Sunday morning. Not all the rescue missions can afford these luxuries, but all try to reach this end sooner or later; and all, without exception, make as much provision for the body as they can.

Fifth: Results Attained.—To the inexperienced these at first seem simply marvellous. They hear the testimonies offered, and count the numbers of those who testify or who come to the anxious benches. The leaders of the missions count up regularly the numbers who rise for prayer through the year, and announce the grand total. As these meetings are held on every evening in the year, it takes only one person per night to evolve three hundred and sixty-five inquirers. But that must be a poor meeting in a rescue mission where only one person rises for prayer. Oftener five, ten, or fifteen rise; and these figures, multiplied by three hundred and sixty-five, make a total that is fairly bewildering. And when this total is taken, as it sometimes is, for that number of real conversions, there is no wonder that enthusiastic souls think that this is the only kind of mission work that is worth doing. Such enthusiasts get into the way of decrying churches, because they can show no such results; and some of them hug to their hearts the very pleasing delusion that they are, *par excellence,* the true missionaries of our times. Weighed in more common-sense balances, these results will dwindle away marvellously. For (*a*) many of those who rise for prayer are "rounders," who have risen in this same mission ten or more times within the year; or they have gone from one mission to another, and have in each risen for prayer. Were these duplications all subtracted from the grand total, the result would not be flattering to the pride of enthusiastic workers. (*b*) Many of the testimonies are fraudulent. There are many "talkers" in every great city, who have an unconquerable desire to hear themselves speak. They are shrewd enough, too, to discern that there is an appetite for highly spiced conversions, and that audiences more enthusiastic than discriminating love to hear "the wickedest man in the city" tell of his conversion. This desire these fraudulent converts satisfy, and that in more missions than one. If stenographic reports of these testimonies at the various missions were taken and then compared, the result would be highly instructive. (*c*) Besides the two classes above alluded to, there is another that must not be lost sight of. This is that of persons who really desire to live better lives, and for a time think that they have been converted. For awhile they run well. But presently the old temptation springs up once more, and they fall victims to its power. Then they drift away from the mission where they thought they experienced a change of heart, only to reappear at some other similar meeting, to go through the process once more, and in doing so to rejoice the hearts of workers and add to the sum total of their "cases."

Yet, in spite of all this sad experience, in these rescue missions there are tangible and permanent results that should make the heart of every honest man rejoice. Not to speak of Jerry McAuley, or Bendigo, or Hadley, there are many of those of whom popular fame knows nothing, who are changed men, and whose lives for many years bear witness to the genuineness of their profession. These are men over whom the organic Church has lost all influence, and who never could have been won by any of her ordinary instrumentalities. But for such missions as these they would have gone down into the pit unhelped. Some of them are diamonds in the rough, who nevertheless have been polished to a marvellous brilliancy. Women, too, have occasionally been rescued who have shone with beautiful radiance for the Master. Those who have been privileged to see such cases, and to follow them for years, find in them the very best "evidences of Christianity" that exist. All the books in the world are not as powerful arguments in favor of the truth as it is in Christ as is one such soul saved from vice, and drunkenness, and filth, and utter degradation, and made over into a new creation in Christ Jesus. Here we can match our religion against all the philosophies of the world, and all the ethical systems that ever were evolved by fertile human brain; for till they can produce such results as these, they can never for a moment compare with true Christianity. I have often thought that argument for Christianity could be met by counter-argument, affirmation by affirmation, and denial by denial. But till these fruits can be matched by other similar fruits, the cause remains still unharmed. And now, lest the impression of what has been said above that may have seemed unfavorable to such rescue missions should convey the belief that I am not in favor of them, let me repeat that some of the sweetest fruitage of all Christian effort has been gathered from such missions.

Sixth: Real Dangers of Rescue Mission Work.—1. The first danger to which I shall allude arises from the financial problem. If none of these converts asked for any financial aid, much of the difficulty of the work would at once cease. Every mission worker will bear witness to the grave complications of this monetary difficulty. To kneel by the side of a man and pray for his conversion, and to hear him pray, and perhaps shed tears of apparent repentance, and then to rise from one's knees and hear him say, "Say, boss, have you got a lodging-house ticket?" is disheartening, to say the least. It makes it difficult to preserve the milk of human kindness sweet. Yet where is the worker who has not had this experience many scores of times? To feel that a refusal may do injury to the one you are trying to help, and that at the same time to give may do equal damage, is to feel that you are in a dilemma from which it is hard to escape on the right side. Nor is this difficulty decreased as you get to know more of the class with whom you have to deal. The more you know, the more complicated the problem becomes. You learn that many of these men meet each other at the lodging-house and "swap" information as to which missions are the most liberal. They know at which there is a supply of "pants," and where you are most likely to get a lodging-house ticket. The lodging-house acts as a bureau of information for them of which they make liberal use. Many of them live for a considerable part of the winter by simply rotating from mission to mission, staying at each as long as they receive anything, and then leaving for new pastures.

As a partial solution of this vexed question, I will give the experience at one of the missions over which I have charge. The pastor was much perplexed by this very situation of which I have been speaking, and applied to me for counsel. After mutual consultation, we decided to try a bold experiment. A notice was to be posted in the vestibule of the church to the effect that "No man will be helped in this church after dark." The pastor could be seen during the day, so that this notice would not involve hardship to any. Then, when the invitation was given for any to rise who wanted to be prayed for, it was distinctly stated, "No one will receive any help at the close of this meeting." This, to deter any from rising with ulterior motives. The result was instantaneous. From an average of fifteen or so, whom we used to have as inquirers, we fell at once to four or five. But, as might have been expected, these were more apt to be genuine cases. The temptation to hypocrisy had been taken away, and the result was most gratifying. It is a significant fact that those missions that give the largest number of lodgings have the largest number of inquirers. St. Bartholomew's Mission, for example, gave last year some 12,194 lodgings and 11,165 meals, and, strange to say, had about 5190 inquirers. The leader of that mission published a statement year before last that in two months over 5000 arose for prayers, of whom, he affirms, fully one third truly abandoned their sins. That is, they had over 1500 true converts from the lowest classes in this city in two months. This is the purest humbug, and the man ought to have known it.

My own impression, after a good deal of experience and much earnest thought, is that this evil will never be conquered excepting by what may seem to some drastic measures. I would advocate a dialogue with each begging inquirer somewhat as follows: "How long have you been sleeping on the street?" "Four nights." "Did you sleep on the streets for Christ or for the devil?" "For the devil." "Well, if you now want to follow Christ, are you willing to sleep on the street *one night,* only *one night,* for Him?" Promise the man that if he will give that much proof of honest intention you will help him. To sleep on the streets is not such an awful thing as some imagine. Our soldiers slept for many nights in the open air for their country. And if the man is not willing to give this much proof of his honesty, you may be pretty sure that he has knelt by your side, not to find salvation, but to beat you out of a night's lodging. But where, oh, where is the mission to be found that would dare to take such a stand as this? It would leave them a precious small lot of inquirers, and, indeed, would cut down their attendance to a marvellous degree.

2. The second danger arises from the tendency of the leaders to become inflated. This is especially true if these are themselves rescued men. They have to speak so often about themselves that they tend to become egotistical. Not all of them yield to this temptation, but alas ! some of them do. They then fall to decrying those who have not had the same experience with themselves, and to sneer at " kid-gloved" Christians, not remembering that kid-gloved Christians are the ones who support their missions. These sneers are agreeable to their rough audiences, and this in itself tempts them to indulge in such innuendoes. Mistaking their inquirers for genuine cases, they begin to count up their converts, and compare them with the additions to the churches, of course much to their advantage. This nurses pride, and so we actually find many of these men thinking that they are the men, and true Christianity will die with them or their converts. Now pride goeth before a fall ; and in this pride we may see the secret cause for the downfall of one and another of these much-lauded reformed men.

3. The third danger arises from the development of a one-sided type of Christian character. Those who are truly converted naturally cling to the mission where they have experienced a change of life. But the type of meeting that rescue mission work necessitates is one that is highly spiced with marvellous "experiences," and has little in it that tends to build stable Christian character. An appetite is created for testimonies of the " wickedest men" and the " biggest drunkards," and the testimony of an ordinary believer who has not been in the gutter is tame, while a calm and helpful exposition of the Word is dull, and if often repeated would create much dissatisfaction. The real knowledge of the Word that such mission converts possess is very small, and is not much increased by the admonitions to which they listen in their places of meeting. This in turn is followed naturally by many a slip in their walk, and much backsliding. In some of the missions an honest effort is made to counteract this evil, and with some measure of success ; but this is the exception and not the rule. The men who are the leaders are for the most part ill fitted to be instructors in the Word, and make many mistakes even when they do undertake it. They for the most part stick close to the miracles of the Master as most easy of handling, and rarely if ever go to the Epistles for their themes.

4. The fourth and last danger I shall allude to arises from the ease with which such a mission can be started and sustained. It is, comparatively speaking, an inexpensive affair. No costly church edifice is needed. A plain store will suffice. No pews or cushions are called for, but only plain, hard wooden benches. No ordained man is called for, but only a layman who can live on a small salary, and then be better off than he was before. The cost of a rescue mission, compared with that of a well-equipped chapel, is very small. This tends to lead some of our churches, which want to do good on a small scale, to start such a mission, simply because it costs less. The result is seen in the springing up of numerous such stations all over the city. If it would not be wearisome, I could give a list of such enterprises as would surprise my readers, who perhaps think that the two McAuley missions, the Bowery mission, St. Bartholomew's, and one or two others complete the catalogue. Not so. There are at least twenty of these rescue missions scattered up and down our city, and they tend to increase rather than to decrease. If ever the time comes when our churches are so fascinated by this work, and are drawn by its inexpensiveness to abandon their chapel and mission church work, it will be a sad day for the city as a whole. There is an undoubted field for the rescue mission, but it is not by any means the most needful thing in our city. We cannot get along without it, but much less can we get along without the well-appointed and therefore somewhat expensive church conducted by wide-awake and earnest ministers of the Gospel, who not only look for conversions, but also for that upbuilding in Christian nurture that alone can make stable Christian men and women.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE JOHANNEAN QUESTION.

BY PROFESSOR W. SANDAY, D.D.

From *The Expositor* (London), December, 1891.

II. The External Evidence.

What exactly is it that, in the case of the Fourth Gospel, external evidence can be expected to do ? It can hardly " prove" that the Fourth Gospel was written by St. John, in a stict sense of the word " prove." Let us take another example. Some fifteen years ago the authorship of the *Vita Antonii*, commonly attributed to St. Athanasius, was challenged by a German scholar, Weingarten,[*] whose results were accepted by Professor Gwatkin[†] and apparently by Dr. Hatch,[‡] though questioned with his usual vigor and knowledge by Keim,[§] and since examined rather more at length in a monograph by Eichhorn.[‖] Here the state of the case as regards external evidence is this. Athanasius died in A.D. 373. The *Vita Antonii* is mentioned as one of his works by Gregory Nazianzen, in a panegyric upon him, delivered soon after 380. Ephraem Syrus died in the same year as Athanasius, and he too mentions the work as by him. Jerome names Athanasius as the author, *De Vir. Ill.* 87, 88, 125, written about A.D. 393. Before this, however, in 375–6, he was already aware that the work had been translated into Latin. The translator was Evagrius, presbyter and afterwards bishop of Antioch, and his version appears to have been made before the death of Innocentius, a friend of Jerome to whom it was addressed, in 374. As this version is headed *Athanasius episcopus ad peregrinos fratres*,[¶] Evagrius himself seems to have regarded Athanasius as the author of the original. It is also expressly ascribed to him in the prologue to the *Life* of St. Ambrose (died 397) by Paulinus, his secretary; by Rufinus of Aquileia, who died 410; in the *Life* of Pachomius, said to be of the fourth century; in the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius, written in 420; and by Socrates the historian, writing about 439; besides a number of other references which do not name the author. A mass of evidence like this I think we may call decisive, and such as to overbear even some internal difficulties. When we consider the various quarters from which the evidence comes, with so many different centres, at Constantinople, Antioch, Edessa, Palestine, Egypt, North Italy, it proves that the *Life* must have passed for the work of St. Athanasius during his lifetime, when not only might its authorship have been easily questioned, but when the motive for foisting it upon him would hardly have been operative.

We cannot of course expect anything like this for the Gospel of St. John. Direct and express ascription to the Apostle begins with Theophilus of Antioch (c. 181 A.D.), we may say, roughly speaking, about a hundred years after the Gospel was composed. From that time it is of course rapidly taken up in a number of the most diverse quarters; it has perhaps already had an elaborate commentary written upon it by the Gnostic Heracleon; it has been used by the heathen philosopher Celsus (c. 178); and it has been included in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. We have abundant proof that from the beginning of the last quarter of the second century the Fourth Gospel is firmly rooted in every branch of the Christian Church, with that one exception of which I shall speak shortly. This consent, strong as it is, no doubt carries us some way back; and it receives corroboration from the traces, of which we shall also have more to say presently, that the Gospel was known and used in the interval. Still, upon the face of it, there is this difference from the *Vita Antonii*, that in the one case direct ascription begins in the lifetime of the author, in the other it is delayed for something like a century. It is obvious to say that an interval like this must prevent the evidence from being decisive. Though again, on the other hand, there are several things to be considered. (1) If we take the ordinary standard of evidence to ancient, and especially to Greek, writings, the Gospel of St. John holds a high place among them. How many, even of the best known classics, rest upon MSS. not older than the tenth or eleventh centuries, and upon the testimony of writers removed by two, three, four, or more centuries from the original! But for the Gospel of St. John we have first-rate MSS. from the fourth century onwards; one version at least certainly (the Latin), and others probably (the Syriac in a high, the Egyptian perhaps in a lower degree) much earlier; and testimonies, abundant, copious, and express all through the second century after composition. (2) Though in the first century the evidence is comparatively scanty, and not quite direct or express, yet much of it shows (notably the *Diatessaron* and Heracleon's *Commentary*) that the Gospel was regarded as authoritative, and that it was interpreted on the same principles as the Old Testament. (3) If the evidence is scanty, this is in large measure due simply to the scantiness of Christian literature. The generations which filled this obscure period (80–180 A.D.) were not much given to writing; and their most elaborate works—the *Exegetica* of Basilides, the *Expositions* of Papias, the *Histories* of Hegesippus—have not survived. (4) The evidence, such as it is, is in some respects specially good in quality. Though the date at which Irenæus wrote his book, *Against Heresies*, is nearly a hundred years after that at which St. John may be supposed to have written the Gospel, there is only a single link between him and the Apostle : he was the pupil of Polycarp, and Polycarp of St. John. Irenæus also frequently appeals to certain venerable persons, "the presbyters," as he calls them, who belonged to the same circle. And besides Irenæus, even under the unfavorable circumstances from the scantiness of the literature to which I have referred, the witnesses to the Fourth Gospel include nearly all the prominent names in the Church of Asia Minor, where it is said to have been written.

---

[*] First in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* (1876), pp. 10–21.

[†] *Studies in Arianism*, pp. 100–103.

[‡] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 154.

[§] *Aus dem Urchristenthum* (1878), p. 207 f.

[‖] *Athanasii de Vita Ascetica Testimonia Collecta.* (Halle, 1886.)

[¶] So Migne's text, evidently from the MSS. (*P.G.* xxvi. 837.)

In such a condition of things, surely those who would cut all connexion between the Gospel and the Apostle leave behind them a great mass of difficulties. I am less sure that the conditions might not be sufficiently satisfied if the author were a disciple of the Apostle. There would then be no greater difficulty in accounting for the transference of his name to it than there is in accounting for the like transference in the case of St. Matthew. I could also myself believe it possible (I do not say probable) that the Gospel was the work of "the presbyter John" rather than the Apostle. The evidence points, as I think, distinctly to a certain time and a certain place ; it is less clear in pronouncing a particular name or in fixing the identity of a particular person.

With these preliminary remarks on the general character of the evidence, I will now go over the more debatable ground with Dr. Schürer. It will be seen at once that I cannot agree with his estimate of the external evidence, careful and apparently judicial as it is : "The utmost one can admit in an unprejudiced way is that the external evidence is evenly balanced *pro* and *con*, and leads to no decision. Perhaps however it would be truer to say, it is more unfavorable than favorable to the authenticity."[*] I should have no hesitation at all in reversing this verdict.

Still there are certain points where I can go some way with Dr. Schürer, and I will begin with these.

In the first place, I am prepared to admit that English critics, myself among them, have not allowed quite enough for the so-called Alogi.[†] I do not think that very much need be allowed for the existence of this party : still, so far as it goes, it does mark a break in the circle of consent, which otherwise, by the time of Irenæus, girdles the whole of what is known of Christendom.

Our information respecting these deniers of the Fourth Gospel, to whom, as is well known, Epiphanius gave the mocking name of "Alogi," comes from two sources, Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 11, 9, and Epiphanius, *Hær.* li. It is probable that the same persons are referred to by both writers. There is also a slight mention of them by Philastrius (*Hær.* 60). We know further, from the inscription on his statue, that Hippolytus wrote a work in defence of the Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse. It appears to be distinctly probable that the long discussion in Epiphanius really goes back to Hippolytus,[*] though much of it seems to be an enlargement by Epiphanius himself in the shape of an elaborate *excursus* on the chronology of the Gospels. Hilgenfeld goes so far as to fix the date of the Hippolytean original from which Epiphanius is quoting from some interesting but tantalizing chronological data given by Epiphanius at the year 218 ; but the reckoning seems precarious, and is disallowed by Zahn. Lightfoot, with better reason, ascribes to Hippolytus the invention of the name "Alogi," noting a similar play upon *νοητός, ἀνόητος* and *δοκός, δοκεῖν, δοκηταί.*[†] Though it is generally agreed that Irenæus and Epiphanius (*i.e.* Hippolytus) are describing the same persons, their opposition to the Fourth Gospel is made to rest on different grounds. From Irenæus we should gather that their interest was anti-Montanistic : in order to cut away the ground from those who professed to belong to a special dispensation of the Paraclete, they denied the Gospel which contained the promise of the Paraclete. In Epiphanius the opposition appears to be directed to the doctrine of the Logos ;[‡] and there is also some internal criticism of the Fourth Gospel by comparison with the Synoptics. Several writers, Heinichen, Lipsius, Hilgenfeld, and Harnack,[§] identify these opponents of the Logos with the Theodotian Monarchians. And it seems to me hard to escape the plain statement of Epiphanius [‖] that the Theodotians are "a branch (*ἀπόσπασμα*) of the Alogos heresy," though there is, it is true, this real difficulty, that the same writer makes them use a verse of St. John (viii. 40 : *ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα*). Perhaps something of this kind may be near the truth. There was a rationalistic party—or tendency, perhaps we should say, rather than party—in the north-west of Asia Minor which directed its opposition at once against Montanism and against the Johannean writings. This latter however had not quite hardened into a definite dogma ; it was not a universal tenet with those who were otherwise allied in opinion ; so that the Fourth Gospel could be used at times when it served their purpose. In this way we may also account for the seeming tolerance extended to them, though the Church did not purge itself of heresy so promptly in these early days as it did later. Both Irenæus and Epiphanius accuse them of the sin against the Holy Ghost. As to their local distribution, Theodotus himself was a native of Byzantium ; we find the party in some force at Thyatira ;[*] and Theodotus probably took with him some of its influence to Rome. In time, it probably flourished in the last quarter of the second century.[†] I incline to think, here with Hilgenfeld and Zahn against Harnack, that there is a covert reference to this party in the Muratorian Fragment.[‡] The stress which is laid in this on the writing of the Gospels, in spite of their different *principia*, corresponds with the elaborate comparison of the openings of the four Gospels in Epiphanius, and the proof that they do not contradict each other. Taking all the *data* together, it is clear that a certain stir was made in the literature of the time, although it would seem, and the language of Epiphanius would lead us to infer, that the sect was not a numerous or powerful one.[§]

---

[*] *Contemporary Review*, p. 416.

[†] The most adequate account of the Alogi in English is perhaps Bishop Lightfoot's, in *The Expositor* for 1890, p. 4 f.

[*] So Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, p. 600 ; Zahn, *Gesch. d. Kan.* i. 223 ff.; Harnack, *N. T. um d. Jahr* 200, p. 59 ; Salmon in *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, iii. 99 ; Lightfoot, *Clement*, ii. 394, ed. 2.

[†] References *ut sup.*

[‡] Zahn denies this (p. 247), but I side on this point rather with Harnack (*N. T. um* 200, p. 63 ff.).

[§] See Hilgenfeld *ut sup.*; Zahn, p. 249 n.; Harnack, p. 65.

[‖] *Hær.* liv. 1.

When it is asked what degree of importance is to be attached to the existence of these opinions in their bearing upon the Fourth Gospel, the answer would seem to be that they are more important in their bearing upon the history of the formation of the canon of the Gospels than in their bearing upon the particular question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. The Alogi, like other opponents of the Apocalypse, avenged themselves upon the obnoxious books by attributing them to Cerinthus. It is clear, therefore, that they had no external tradition to go upon. What tradition they had is so far in favour of the early date of the Gospel, that it assigns it, if not to St. John, yet to a contemporary and companion figure of St. John. But the real grounds of objection were evidently not historical, but dogmatic and critical. As against the clear recognition of the Gospel at the date when these objections were raised in Asia Minor as well as elsewhere—by Melito, by Claudius Apollinaris, by Polycrates, in the affiliated Churches of Vienne and Lyons, by Irenæus, the inheritor of the traditions of Polycarp—they cannot count for much. They prevent us from speaking of complete unanimity, but hardly more.

Another point, which I should myself abstain from pressing, is the evidence of the *Clementine Homilies*. The discovery of Dressel's MS. placed the use of the Fourth Gospel in the *Homilies* beyond a doubt ; but there still remains the question as to the date to which the evidence belongs, and we cannot confidently assert that this is one at which its weight in the scale would be considerable. After the time of Irenæus a single witness, however clear, is of no great importance ; but it is more probable that the *Homilies* in their present form are after Irenæus than before.

Much the same thing applies to the Muratorian Fragment. I was for some time in the habit of dating this about the year 170 A.D. ; but I now think that this is too early. I do not think that we can safely put the original before about 200. Zahn descends a little lower, to about 210 A.D.[*] It will be remembered that Bishop Lightfoot conjectured that it might be an early work of Hippolytus, written about 190 A.D.[†] The year 200 A.D., as an approximate date, is one to which I think that not much exception can be taken.

Here the qualifications which I should be inclined to put upon my own former statement of the evidence end.[‡] For the rest I cannot but think that the case has been considerably strengthened by the discoveries and investigations of recent years.

It is in particular a fact of no small importance to be able to lay our hands on the actual *Diatessaron* of Tatian, at least or something definite and tangible which is near enough to the *Diatessaron* for our purpose. The *Address to the Greeks* made it clear that Tatian used the Fourth Gospel, and reasonable people had little doubt that extracts from the same Gospel were included in the *Diatessaron.* Now we have the extracts before our eyes.

---

[*] Epiph., *Hær.* li. 33.

[†] Zahn places the appearance of the Alogi about the year 170 A.D. (*Gesch. d. K.* i. 257) ; Harnack about 160 A.D. (*Dogmengesch.* i. 307, ed. 2).

[‡] Zahn, *G. d. K.* i. 222 ; Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, p. 599 ; Harnack, *N. T. um* 200, p. 69.

[§] ὀλίγον τῇ δυνάμει.—*Hær.* li. 35.

[*] *Gesch. d. K.* ii. 136.

[†] *Clement.* ii. 405 ff., 495.

[‡] I am glad to see, however, that in 1876 I spoke with due caution as to the *Clementine Homilies*, and left open the space 170–190 A.D. for the Muratorian canon (*Gosp. in Second Cent.*, pp. 161, 265).

The importance of this is, in a large measure, indirect, because it strengthens the chain in regard to Justin. If Justin's pupil marked off the four canonical Gospels in such a way as to compose a harmony of them and of them only, it becomes increasingly probable that Justin himself meant the same four Gospels by the "Memoirs of the Apostles" to which he refers as his authorities. Justin is writing, not as a bishop for his flock, but as a philosopher and man of letters for a wider public; he therefore aims at a more classical-sounding title than that to which the little communities of Christians were becoming accustomed. That by the "Memoirs" he means our four Gospels is not of course dependent upon any reflected evidence of Tatian's, but it is confirmed by that evidence. With the three Synoptic Gospels we are not concerned. Neither is it necessary any longer to prove that Justin was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel. The position now usually taken up by those who question the genuineness of the Gospel is that he was acquainted with it, but used it so sparingly as to show that he did not regard it as possessing apostolic authority. This is the view adopted by Dr. Schürer. It is also the view which was somewhat elaborately maintained in this country by Dr. Edwin A. Abbott.[*]

In reference to this position, I may perhaps be allowed to repeat some remarks which I made in my *Inaugural Lecture* delivered February 21st, 1883.

> "'Use proves knowledge, but comparatively sparing use proves doubt and hesitation.' It is evident, upon the face of it, that the inference here is most precarious. How many other causes will account for the sparing use of any particular document besides the attribution to it of defective authority! Possibly the reason may have been some quite trivial mechanical one, such as that Justin had only intermittent access to a MS. of the document in question; for Justin was a somewhat migratory person, and to carry about a whole Bible, Old Testament as well as New, was not such an easy matter in those days. Besides, though the Fourth Gospel is now known to have been certainly circulated in the first half of the second century, it would seem to have come into circulation somewhat slowly. To begin with, it was probably written some twenty years later than St. Matthew and St. Mark, and at least ten years after St. Luke. The Synoptic tradition thus had time to preoccupy the public mind, while its apparent simplicity made it more readily assimilated. The relative frequency with which the Synoptic Gospels are quoted is only what we should have expected beforehand. And the disproportion between the references to St. John, as compared with St. Mark and St. Luke, is not greater, if it is so great, as that between these Gospels and St. Matthew. At almost every turn it seems to me that some other hypothesis will equally well explain the facts alleged by Dr. Abbott. But there is one simple argument that I cannot but think sufficient to invalidate his whole position. By precisely the same mode of reasoning it might be proved that Justin recognized none, or only one, of St. Paul's Epistles, at a time when his opponent, the heretic Marcion, certainly recognised ten of them."[*]

The question of the use of the Fourth Gospel by Justin remains much as it was when this was written. Nothing better on the subject has yet appeared, or is likely to appear, than the three articles contributed by Dr. James Drummond to the *Theological Review* in October, 1875, and April and July, 1877, and the exact and searching examination in Dr. Ezra Abbot's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 1880. With these before us, we must not, I think, be too ready to concede that Justin's use of the Gospel is quite so sparing as it is sometimes made out to be. I am not going again over ground which has been so admirably worked already. I would only point out two things: First, that Dr. Drummond and Dr. Ezra Abbot between them have clearly made out that the doctrine of the Logos, which bears so large a place in Justin, however much in its expansion and development it may have been affected by Philo and the Stoics, yet has its roots in the Johannean doctrine, and derives from that its specifically Christian features. Justin certainly is fully possessed with the idea of the incarnation. He uses for it not once or twice, but repeatedly, the phrases σαρκοποιηθείς, ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, which can have come from no other source but the Fourth Gospel.[†] He also distinctly held the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Logos, and appeals for it to his authorities, which in this case cannot be the Synoptics. He further directly applies to the Logos the title μονογενής, again appealing to the "Memoirs," which cannot be anything else than St. John i. 14, 18. Here too I must distinctly hold that Dr. Drummond and Dr. Ezra Abbot have clearly made out their case, though it has met with opposition. And quite independently of our English and American scholars, Dr. Resch speaks of the reference to St. John as "ganz sicher." With such fundamental ideas drawn directly from the Gospel, I do not think that we can rightly call Justin's use of it hesitating or uncertain.

---

[*] In two articles in the *Modern Review* for July and October, 1881.

[*] *The Study of the New Testament*, etc., p. 10 f.

[†] See the references in Abbot, *Critical Essays*, p. 144 (=*Authorship*, etc., p. 42). Compare also σωματοποιήσασθαι, *Dial.*, c. 70.

But, secondly, in addition to these primary conceptions, Dr. Abbot has enumerated some fifteen or sixteen instances of coincidence between Justin and the Fourth Gospel,* nearly all of which seem to me to have some real foundation, and several of them to be beyond question. Among these I include of course the passage relating to the "new birth."

Of one passage, or rather group of passages, in particular, Dr. Abbot speaks doubtfully. The group in question is one which seems to point to St. John i. 13, "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." There is here a remarkable various reading—known to several of the Latin Fathers, Irenæus (twice), Tertullian (three times), and Ambrose and Augustine (once each), and found also in Cod. Veronensis (*b*) of the Old Latin—according to which "who *was* born" (ὃς ἐγεννήθη) is substituted for "who *were* born" (οἱ ἐγεννήθησαν), and the reference is made to be not to the "children of God," but to the incarnate Word. If Justin alludes to the passage, it is in this form. Dr. Resch, who takes up the question, assumes confidently that he does allude to it;* and I confess that I am inclined to agree with him. The allusions are of course very free, but it seems to me decidedly probable that this verse of St. John lies at the bottom of them. To appreciate the force of the probability we need to have the Greek of the passages before us. We need also to remember that there is a further reading, ἐξ αἵματος (for ἐξ αἱμάτων), found also in two MSS. (*b* and *q*) of the Old Latin, in Tertullian (twice), Hilary (once), Augustine (in two treatises), Eusebius, Epiphanius, and according to Baethgen, also in the Curetonian Syriac. This too seems to be implied by Justin.

St. John i. 13

(as apparently read by Justin).

[ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ] ὃς (T.R. *οἳ*) *οὐκ ἐξ αἵματος* (T.R. *αἱμάτων*) *οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθη* (T.R. *ἐγεννήθησαν*).

Apol. I. 32.	*Dial.* c. 54.	*Dial.* c. 63.	*Dial.* c. 76.
οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως.	*αἷμα μὲν ἔχει ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου σπέρματος ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως.*	*ὡς τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος γεγεννημένου, ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος Θεοῦ.*	*τὸ γὰρ ὡς υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου εἰπεῖν, φαινόμενον μὲν καὶ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον μηνύει, οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνου δὲ σπέρματος ὑπάρχοντα δηλοῖ . . . ὅτι αἷμα μὲν ἔχειν αὐτὸν προεμήνυεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων.*

Of course I can understand the use of the passage being questioned; but, bearing in mind the two postulates, (1) that Justin certainly was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, (2) that the readings involved were certainly present to both Irenæus and Tertullian (for the principal reading at least is confirmed by the context in all the instances), we shall, I think, look at the coincidences with different eyes; and to me at least the probability of direct connexion seems considerable.

This is not the only case in which Dr. Resch refers the peculiar form of Justin's quotations to a various reading in his MS. In the disputed, but, as I consider, quite certain, quotation of St. John iii. [3], 5, there are two variants which stand out above the rest: *ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννήθητε* (for *ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν*), and *εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν* (for *εἰς τ. β. τοῦ Θεοῦ*). Of these the latter is found in the first hand of ℵ, in two forms of the Old Latin (*e* and *m*), in the *Clementine Homilies*, Tertullian, and a number of patristic authorities; the former is found in the *Clementine Homilies*, the *Clementine Epitome*, Irenæus as quoted in a *catena*, Eusebius, Athanasius, and a number of other Fathers.† The first reading, *τῶν οὐρανῶν* for *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, is, no doubt wrongly, admitted by Tischendorf into his text. The question is not whether either reading is right, but whether it is not merely a case of free quotation on the part of Justin but an actual variant in his MS. The wide diffusion of the two readings gives some countenance to the latter view. Both readings are paraphrases, and paraphrases that lie sufficiently near at hand; but when the same paraphrase is found in a number of different writers, its currency is more easily accounted for if it had found its way into MSS.

---

* *Critical Essays*, pp. 31-43, 47-52.

* *Agrapha*, p. 22 f.

† Fully given by Abbot, *Crit. Ess.*, p. 38. We note besides that *renascor* appears largely in Latin texts (see Westcott and Hort *ad loc.*).

Yet one more variant of which Dr. Resch finds a trace in Justin is *ἐκ γενετῆς πηρόν* for *τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς*, in St. John ix. 1. This reading occurs twice in Justin (*Apol.* i. 22, *Dial.* c. 69), and it is shared by him with the *Clementine Homilies* (xix. 21) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (v. 7, 17). Again there is something of a case—not quite so strong as the last, but yet appreciable—for assuming a variant in the MS.

With this group of phenomena from Justin I will stop. It might probably be increased considerably if we had access to the original text of Tatian. But I have not found a Johannean variant which, remembering the number of *media* through which that text has passed, seems to me sufficiently established to be used in an argument. There is another interesting but isolated example from the *Commentary* of Heracleon (c. 170–180 A.D.[*]), in regard to which we are expressly told by Origen that Heracleon's text gave the Samaritan woman *six* husbands instead of *five.*[†] It has not, I believe, been noticed that there are traces of this reading also in Tertullian; there is no mention of it in the critical editions, but it is clearly implied in *Pudic.* 11: *Ut cum Samaritanæ sexto jam matrimonio non mœchæ, sed prostitutæ, etiam quod nemini facile, quis esset ostendit.* Tertullian probably got this reading from Italy, where it must have had a certain range of circulation.

Justin therefore is not the only writer anterior to Irenæus who has a text already corrupt; and these corruptions have no little significance, even when deduction is made for the possibility that the coincidences may be accidental. Really this possibility, all things considered, is not large. When the readings in question are examined, we see that they have all very much the same character. We should set them down at once as what are technically called Western readings. But what does that mean? These Western readings did not arise in Ephesus; they did not arise in the province of Asia. A number of indications point to the region in which they did arise: it was Syria, if we may not be more precise, and say at Antioch or in the neighbourhood. Here for some time there must have been an active centre of copyists and students, who went on working upon the same lines. The different attestation of different Western readings shows that they were not introduced all at once, but came by successive accretions. The readings in Justin are very fairly consistent; but even they cannot well have come in with a single MS. For a text to have got such a stamp as it has in Justin time is required. We cannot say definitely what time. But I, for one, should feel that the phenomena are more easily and naturally explicable if the Gospel was written about the time to which the tradition of the Church ascribes it than at any of the later dates which criticism has suggested.

Mounting upwards from Justin, we come to the early Gnostics and the apostolic Fathers. And here I cannot help wishing that this chapter could have been written a little later. On both subjects important works are on the way, to which I wish that I could refer in print. I allude to a paper on Basilides recently read at Oxford by Dr. James Drummond, and another on the "Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels," by Dr. C. Taylor, announced as in preparation among the Cambridge *Texts and Studies.*

In the common chronology Valentinus is usually set down as flourishing about the year 140 (the approximate date at which he came to settle in Rome), and Basilides as flourishing about the year 125. But Dr. Hort gives reasons for thinking that they were more nearly contemporary, and the system of Basilides is in part posterior to that of Valentinus. It would therefore be better to put the *floruit* of Basilides a little later.

Did either of them use the Fourth Gospel? If they did, the fact has an important bearing upon its history. Dr. Schürer is content to dismiss the question by saying: "Whether the fragments of the Gnostics which are given in the *Philosophumena* came from Basilides and Valentinus themselves is very uncertain. Probably the writings referred to are later productions of the school of Basilides and Valentinus."[*] Clearly the matter cannot rest there.

In regard to Valentinus, we are met at the outset by the statement of Tertullian that he apparently used all the Gospels accepted by the Church.[*] We may not, however, lay too much stress upon this, as Tertullian's knowledge of Valentinus himself seems to have been mainly, if not entirely, at second hand. Of more importance is the assertion of Irenæus that the Valentinians made great use of the Gospel.[†] This is abundantly borne out for the Valentinians, if not for Valentinus. After Valentinus himself, his disciples branched off into two main schools, a Western and an Eastern. The two leading masters of the Western or Italian school were Ptolemæus and Heracleon. But Irenæus gives us a full specimen of the way in which Ptolemæus treated the Scriptures (*Adv. Hær.* i. 8, 5); and that specimen is based on the prologue to St. John. Hippolytus also quotes some unnamed representative of this branch who appealed to St. John x. 8.[‡] Heracleon, as we have seen, wrote a commentary on the Gospel. From the Eastern branch we have the *Excerpta Theodoti*, preserved with the works of Clement of Alexandria.[§] Not all of these *Excerpts* really belong to the Eastern school, but the part which does belong to it contains numerous quotations from the Gospel (§§ 6, 7, 17, 19, 26, 41).

---

[*] According to Heinrici, 150–160 A.D. (*Valentinianische Gnosis*, p. 14). Lipsius (*Dict. Chr. Biog.* iv. 1079) seems inclined to place him later, but questions the statement of Origen that Heracleon was personally acquainted with Valentinus, without sufficient reason. See also Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 54 f., ed. 5.

[†] *Apud* Stieren, *Irenæus*, p. 195: Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν ἀνέγνωμεν· πέντε ἄνδρας, ἔσχες· παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ἡρακλέωνι εὕρομεν· ἓξ ἄνδρας ἔσχες.

[*] *Contemporary Review*, p. 413.

This then is the way in which the evidence stands. Both branches of the school are studded with direct and express quotations from the Fourth Gospel. And this surely lends a strong presumption that the founder of the school used and recognized it, a presumption which is confirmed by the fact that Valentinus himself gave names to his æons ('Αλήθεια, Λόγος, Ζωή), which the Fourth Gospel appears to have suggested.[‖]

I would rather state the argument thus, than with Dr. Salmon lay stress upon the common use of the Gospel by Valentinians and Catholics. When we find Catholics, Nestorians, and Jacobites alike using the Peshitto version, we may take that as valid proof that the Peshitto was common to the whole Syriac Church before its disruption. But the machinery for the expulsion of heretics did not work so surely in the second century as in the fourth. Valentinus was not ejected until he came to Rome, and his disciples may well have kept up a sort of loose connexion. I could conceive the work of an Apostle being taken up among them after Valentinianism came to be stamped as a heresy. I am not aware of any evidence that Basilides was expelled from the Church at all. He may have been, but we must not assume it.

The following of Basilides was not so powerful or so widespread as that of Valentinus; and here there are not so many possible claimants for Basilidian doctrine. It is however well known that there are two conflicting systems which go by the name of Basilides: one represented by Agrippa Castor, Irenæus, Pseudo-Tertullian, Philaster, and Epiphanius, on the one hand (the last three probably reducible to the lost *Syntagma* of Hippolytus, and that again with Irenæus probably based on the similar work now lost of Justin), and Clement of Alexandria with the *Refutation* of Hippolytus, on the other. It is natural to suppose that the first group must have the preference on account of its earlier date. But against this is to be set the fact that Clement certainly had before him the *Exegetica* of Basilides himself; and the tenour of his quotations agrees with the account in the later work of Hippolytus. The system there described is also without doubt, both morally and intellectually, by far the higher and worthier of an original mind of the two. I incline therefore to think that we have in it the real work of Basilides, gathered from his writings, while Agrippa Castor or Justin (= Irenæus + the lost *Syntagma* of Hippolytus) drew their accounts rather from hearsay and intercourse with disciples.[*] I have done my best to form this opinion impartially, though the account which is thus vindicated for Basilides contains two unequivocal quotations from St. John.

Here then, I cannot but think, is serious matter for the consideration of the opponents of the Gospel. We are getting perilously near St. John's time, and the gap in the evidence is unexpectedly filling up: behind Irenæus comes, not only the group of more or less fragmentary writers, Theophilus, Melito,[†] Athenagoras, Claudius Apollinaris, not only Tatian with his *Diatessaron*, following upon his master Justin, but two well-established schools, in different continents, of the disciples of Valentinus. And then behind Justin we need hardly appeal to the indirect evidence borne by Papias and Polycarp to the Gospel through the first

---

[*] "Integro instrumento uti videtur."—*De Præscr.*, c. 38.

[†] Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Joannem plenissime utentes."—*Adv. Hær.* iii. 11. 7.

[‡] *Hær.* vi. 35.

[§] According to Zahn (*Forschungen* iii. 117 ff.), these were taken from the eighth book of the *Stromateis*; according to Lipsius (*Dict. Chr. Biog.* iv. 1082), they belonged rather to the work περὶ ἀρχῶν or to the first book of the *Hypotyposes*.

[‖] Iren., *Adv. Hær.* iii. 11. 1 (supposed to be derived from the *Syntagma* of Justin). Compare the following from Jacobi, art. "Gnosis" in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie* v. 228 (ed. 2): "Die valentinischen Grundbegriffe entsprechen dem Evangelium Johannes so sehr, dass es one Zweifel schon bei Valentin die grosse Bedeutung gehabt die es in dessen Schule behauptet."

[*] This is substantially the view of Dr. Hort, Dr. Ezra Abbot, Dr. Drummond, and Jacobi; the other view is still held by Hilgenfeld, and was at one time (I do not know whether it is now) held by Lipsius.

[†] Ezra Abbot, *Crit. Ess.*, p. 59.

Epistle, for by their side we have the two heresiarchs, rescued from oblivion, Valentinus and Basilides. Is not this a powerful phalanx to fill the vacant spaces of the second century?

And now, as if to crown all, there comes a rumour of a discovery made by Dr. C. Taylor that the famous passage about the fourfold Gospel in Irenæus is already prefigured in Hermas. From a less trusty hand we might well hesitate to receive such a windfall; but we shall certainly look with no common interest for the coming instalment of the Cambridge *Texts and Studies.* The exact date of Hermas is a difficult and debated question; between the two solutions (c. 100 A.D. and c. 140 A.D.) there is a difference of a full generation. The mere fact that the fourfold Gospel was recognised would, I think, weigh rather strongly in the scale in favour of the later date of the two. But even so, supposing that this recognition were made good, it would be equivalent to carrying back the *Diatessaron* itself a generation earlier than we have placed it. And thus the results to which our inquiries would seem to point in regard to Justin, Valentinus, and Basilides would receive a brilliant and unexpected confirmation. Of course, we must not count upon this until we have it in our hands; and yet I confess that those inquiries themselves make the rumoured discovery very far from incredible. It would be only as it were the keystone, binding together and making solid the scattered conclusions to which detailed criticism of other writers would seem to be leading.

In any case, we have a state of things which, if, as I have said, it does not "prove" the Gospel straight away to be the work of St. John, proves what is for practical purposes very much the same thing. Not until 180 A.D. do we have the actual name of the Apostle affixed to the Gospel; but long before that we have it circulating in the Christian world as an authoritative document—a document interpreted and used like a sacred book, a document appealed to for the establishment both of fact and of doctrine. If the inquiries which are now in progress should have the result which it seems very possible they may have, three consequences will follow: (1) The view which places the composition of the Gospel in the second century will be clearly untenable; (2) it will be established that the Gospel had its origin in some leading Christian circle at the time and place which tradition assigns to it; (3) it will be increasingly probable that its author was St. John.

REMINISCENCES OF CARDINAL MANNING.

BY WILFRID MEYNELL, SARAH M. SHELDON AMOS, BENJAMIN WAUGH, AND EDITOR CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), February, 1892.

I THINK it was Bolingbroke who, when asked what Marlborough's faults had been, replied: "He was so great a man, I had forgotten he had any." Such will be the verdict passed on Cardinal Manning by all who knew him. If signs in love are more than proofs, as Coventry Patmore somewhere says, so also are they in religion. The proofs of Cardinal Manning's pieties are known to all—they are official. But the signs were shown in his most unrecollected moments to his intimates. His idlest words were from this point of view more edifying than even his pastorals. A noble figure was his on the platform and in the pulpit; but where he was at his best and greatest was in his own armchair. There used to be an impression that the Cardinal was nothing if not a diplomatist. Assuredly he had worldly as well as heavenly wisdom—a prudence which is a Cardinal's as well as a cardinal virtue. But none of the common devices of the diplomatist were his—he smiled at them in Italian ecclesiastics. It was the frankness and not the reticence of his conversation that took me by surprise when he permitted me to pass with him what were I think his idlest hours at Archbishop's House. "After nine there will be no interruption," was a hint he gave me quite early in our intercourse, and "Come to me with the bats" is the burden of nearly two hundred notes I have been looking through, all precious as proceeding from his hand. At that hour I found him with the cares and prayers of the day done, weary indeed, yet wakeful and alert. I think he liked, not indeed to put aside the ecclesiastic, for that was second or even first nature to him, but to talk to a layman whose interests were not exactly ecclesiastical, who did not possess "a liturgical soul," and whose conversation was—not all in Heaven. My deep attachment to him was, I suppose, apparent through a certain freedom of speech which he never sought to curtail. There is a form of mania in which a man called upon to admire, say a shelf of precious glass, feels constrained to sweep it down with the wave of his arm. The same impulse it was that nearly overmastered an imaginative traveller—or he thought so—to tickle, instead of kissing, the Pontifical foot. Most of us regard, in one way or another, this sort of incongruity as the soul of wit. Thus possessed, I more than once committed what I thought the Cardinal would regard as vagaries of speech, often to be astonished by his ready assent. "Stop a bit, stop a bit," or "Jockey of Norfolk, not so fast," he would sometimes say, where a conventional Cardinal must surely have been indignant or grim. This liberty of speech which he allowed to others he also took for himself, having moods in which he spoke with a sort of serious jest. This was not the only trait he had in common with Blessed Thomas More.

In the inner room at Archbishop's House, where Cardinal Manning received his more intimate callers, there hung, opposite to where he sat, a portrait of St. Charles Borromeo, Cardinal and Archbishop of Milan. This was the Cardinal's favourite saint and model archbishop. When the centenary of English Sunday Schools was commemorated, a monument was erected by Nonconformists, and on it was inscribed the name of Cardinal Borromeo, as that of the pioneer of the Sunday School. That incident, which delighted the Cardinal, suggests at once the kinship between the two men, which was close at every turn; and when Manning returned from Rome as a priest in 1854, he founded the community of Oblates of St. Charles at Bayswater, with whom he lived until he succeeded to the Archbishopric of Westminster in 1865. There his library of old days remains, row on row of Anglican divinity. From his beloved Oblates he chose his confessor, of whom he wrote in terms of the most tender affection in the last letter he ever penned. One day in Milan, St. Charles Borromeo was playing cards with two of his priests (perhaps the only thing in which the Archbishop of Westminster never wished to imitate him), when the talk turned on the moments of death, and on what each would do if he, then and there, heard the last summons. "I would flee to the church," said one. "I would call on the name of the Lord," said another. "And I," said St. Charles, "would go on with the game." Such was the spirit in which this Oblate on the throne of Westminster undertook every task, the lightest, of his life. In the love of God and man he performed his indifferent actions, talked politics and read newspapers, went each afternoon to the Athenæum Club, and lectured before the Royal Society, loitered in the House of Commons and wandered among the crowds at Marlborough House garden-parties; nor would he have flinched to meet at any moment the messenger which came to him at last so calmly—almost collusively.

The Borromean anecdote had its match. This time it was Cardinal Manning and two of his priests who made choice, when each was asked what he would be were he not a priest. "A doctor," said one, still dreaming of the service of man. "A temperance advocate," said another, with becoming solemnity. "And I," said the Cardinal, "Radical member for Marylebone"—just then politically the rowdiest of metropolitan areas. To him the service of his Creator and of his fellow-creatures was identical, so that he never thought it necessary to talk piety in order to feel he had been clerical. He had all his model's sanity of sanctity. The one played cribbage for the glory of God, and the other for the same cause discussed with Sir Charles Dilke the limitation of electoral areas in the Redistribution Bill (of which he saw one of the advanced drafts prepared for the Cabinet); the Education Act with Mr. Forster, whom he greatly respected; the prevention of cruelty to children with the Rev. Benjamin Waugh, in whose praise, as in that of many Dissenters, he was firm; the iniquity of theatres with the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes —"his only fault one that cures itself—his youth;" the most painful of all subjects with Mr. Stead; the Land League with Mr. Michael Davitt; standing armies with Lord Wolseley; ancient Scandinavia with Mr. Paul du Chaillu; local option with Sir Wilfrid Lawson; vivisection (which he loathed as Browning loathed it) with Miss Frances Power Cobbe; the Salvation Army with General Booth, to whom he made a public profession of attachment; art with Mr. Ruskin, who took him to exhibitions in Bond Street; and nationalisation of the land with Mr. Henry George, whom I took to him one Sunday afternoon, and silently listened while one said that his love of our Lord led him to love man, and the other that his love of man led him to love our Lord—the Mount, whence came the Sermon, being the beginning of the spiritual journey of the one and the end of that of the other. These came and went, and sometimes heard no more pious speech than a "God bless you;" but they were none the less conscious that they had held converse with a fervent Christian. He needed no catchwords, and used no shibboleths to reach the heart of hearts. It was said of him once that he was photographed for the Church's glory, and there was, in a simple and beautiful sense, a subtle truth in the saying.

This absence of direct preachment never led any one, the most foolish, to suppose he was indifferent to dogmas—Christian and Catholic. What his own life of devotion was, that he wished the lives of all his clergy to be. Beautiful and inspiring were the addresses he gave them—then was a time when his Master's name was on his lips at every breath, as it was always in his heart. Between no man's words and acts was there ever so complete a parity. He denied himself the indulgences he ceded to others. The cigarette, which has penetrated everywhere, even into a convent during a "ladies' retreat," got no entrance into Archbishop's House. The cigar was a waste and indulgence beyond words; and though he had been an athlete at Harrow he did not like his clergy to care for sports. "I do not like a priest to run after a piece of leather," he said, with characteristic summariness of thought and speech, when he heard of a clerical football player. Yet he took a five-bar gate when he went to Ushaw College in the sixties.

That his great heart had pastoral disappointments, both in his clergy and in his laity, he did not conceal, as well as great and more abiding consolations. He measured their and our corn in his own bushel. He rated us by his own standard, and his standard, like his rank, was the highest of all—that ideal blending of rank with real pre-eminence which the world needs to have recalled to it now and then. He saw, for instance, the havoc made by the drink traffic. It confronted him as he walked the streets by day; it haunted him on his narrow bed at night, when the voice of a drunken singer floated in on his loneliness, and was interpreted by his sensitive ears into sounds which he did not hear, but which cried to Heaven—the sob of the wifehood and the motherhood of England, the wail of the beaten child. And when men told him calmly (I give the statement from his standpoint only) that they feared spiritual pride dogged the steps of teetotalism, he had no patience left in him. He asked for water, and they gave him the sour wine of pedantries. I think it was not altogether without a qualm that he allowed the sherry he had renounced to be put on the table at that open early dinner at Archbishop's House; but a bishop must, by the Gospel rule, be "given to hospitality;" and how does he know, anyway, that there is not among his guests one to whom St. Paul himself would command a little wine for the stomach's sake? So there the hated decanter stood, and there, if nowhere else, a guest had an approach to experience of what may be called furtive drinking; for he was unwilling to meet the eye of his host while his lips touched the banned liquid. Perhaps the Cardinal felt it necessary to give to Rome and the world this practical proof that he was not a Manichæan—a heresy hinted against him by those who thought it unbecoming for a Cardinal Archbishop to talk teetotalism on a Sunday afternoon from a cart on Clerkenwell Green. These were content to take the Ten Commandments as they stand, without seeking to remove the main stumbling-block in the way of mankind's keeping of them. Many of his clergy, however, as is well known, joined the temperance movement, and became his effective lieutenants.

As he did not think there was one law for the clergy and another for the laity in matters of self-denial, his disappointment at the absence of enthusiasm for teetotalism among educated laymen was second only to his disappointment at the absence of it among the mass of his priests. "I have piped and they have not danced," he said one evening. "There is not one gentleman who will give up one glass of sherry to help me in the battle." Once, when he made as though he would weep over the indifference of Babylon, I gave the serviceless offer of my own adhesion. "No," he said, "not now. You must get your wife's permission." It was one of the privileges of Cardinal Manning, denied to most men, to be influential by mere personal example; and never did he forget or minimise this added obligation. *A propos*, one sometimes wonders what reforms might be effected, might be even fashionable, if some prince had taken him for his tutor or his model.

What fashion might effect in England, nationalism is resolved to effect in Ireland—happy to be socially governed by a more progressive force than ours. "Ireland sober and Ireland free" was the magical combination which the year 1889 inscribed on many an Irish banner. The Archbishop of Dublin sent all the preliminary papers to Westminster, and the heart of the English Archbishop gave a leap of delight. In that moment he forgot the sorrow that had accumulated with the years, his sorrow over each Irish name he encountered in the records of the London police-courts. When he scanned his *Times* (this he did every morning, and lived in London—thus defying Mr. Ruskin's complete recipe for demoralisation), he looked nervously down the reports of the police-court cases, and whenever his eye caught the name of a son or, worse luck, of a daughter of Erin, his face moved with a strange emotion. These were the sheep of his pasture. But he was not only the spiritual shepherd of the flock—he was the Englishman who felt a political debt to Ireland, a social debt to her exiles, a personal and religious debt to her Catholicism. No better news could come from Ireland to Archbishop's House than that which announced the addition of teetotalism to the watchword of the movement of freedom.

But the Cardinal did, as a rule, bring down to a personal issue the principles on which he was in conflict with others. There were times when he had a sharp tongue for foes and for dissentient friends, to whom, nevertheless, he would have done any kindness at any sacrifice of his own personal comfort—the last thing he ever considered. "What can you expect," he asked of a dignitary who did not take his advice in a moment of some emergency, "brought up as he was in a hen-coop, as I call the ———?" and he named a community he truly loved and admired; and shortly afterwards he told me he had gone out of his way to show special kindness to the very noble-hearted bishop whose affairs had occasioned the epithet. "Yes," he would say of his flock, when they did not rise to some great occasion, "I never forget they are my *sheep.*" And yet another animal served at times the purpose of a fitting comparison: "Ever since I became a Catholic, I have found it necessary to cultivate a great devotion to Balaam's ass."

A briefer pang, but a severe one while it lasted, was that which he suffered from the estrangement between his own sympathies and those of probably the bulk of his clergy on the publication of "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon." The great Cardinal, away in his barrack-like palace, saw only two things—first, the wrong done to womanhood, and to that only more appealing thing—womanhood in childhood; and, secondly, the good intentions of Mr. Stead. "I say to you" (and he never spoke more solemnly) "we are up in a balloon. Our priests have become machines for administering the sacraments. There was a time when there was grace, but there were no sacraments; now there are sacraments, but where is grace?" It was a mood of the moment, and whence came it? I think from the attitude taken by an ever-faithful friend, who had followed his leader into teetotalism, and had given him a personal service which few men devote to another. "Read that," said the Cardinal, handing him a *Pall Mall* in 1885. "I have no permission to read evil which it is not necessary for me to know," was the instant reply. So the Cardinal was for the moment in high dudgeon. Once, when I had said it was consoling to find that even Cardinals had human sensitivenesses, "No," he said, with a sweet gravity; "no; it is very disappointing." I hold to my own opinion still. It is not spiritual pride, but spiritual despondency that one most encounters in the world; and it is some comfort, at any rate, to find that when these saints are scratched there is blood below—yet to know they are the very Elect notwithstanding.

His manners with ladies were always charming; and his bow, when he took off the hat of more than Quaker brim, was a homage the most gracious ever made. It was not often that he permitted himself a mere compliment; when he did so it was only because a neat phrase carried him away. "You have given me a book which has kept me awake, and I bring you a book to send you to sleep." The book which had *not* kept him awake was a volume of poems of a tone he hardly caught. The book to send the poet to sleep was a collection of his own sermons. This reminds me that he told me that the last time he had seen Dr. Whewell, whom he greatly admired from his youth, was in a church where he himself was preaching. Whatever compliment he felt in having the omniscient mathematician as a hearer vanished as he watched him fall into a tranquil slumber. Mr. Bright, by the way, he once saw amongst his audience in a church in Rome; but he did not get much comfort out of him either. "I liked it all," said Bright when next they met, "except your sermon." It was on a theme the most misunderstood—the Blessed Virgin.

His indifferent attitude about his books was quite real—a genuine conquest of his humility over his sensitiveness, and it was all the more to his merit inasmuch as they never had the recognition they deserve. He must have known very well how good they were; though few others found it out. It cannot be said that a paper like the *Athenæum* does less than justice to the secular authors of the day. If it errs, it errs as it ought to do, on the side of kindness. But a paper like the *Athenæum* may be said to have had no cognisance of Cardinal Manning's works. The same strenuous thought in the same strenuous language, on almost any other subject, would have made a reputation, and those MSS. written across large foolscap on his knee (as St. John wrote his Gospels, he said, with the look which gave his words their meaning) would, for novelist or for historian, have won fortune and applause. The back seat to which the Christian public of England relegates serious religious literature is a little puzzling perhaps; and certainly those who grudge the Churchman what advantages he gains from his cloth may be consoled to think that he encounters, as an author, a prejudice which, in some instances, and certainly in Cardinal Manning's, is less than just.

Once in writing to a lady a letter which lies before me, the Cardinal advanced a theory of the relations between reader and author which will not find a general acceptance. An author usually spends the more time on his writings that the reader may spend the less. "Read that book slowly," wrote the Cardinal; "it took me long to write it, and I feel sure it needs time to read it." But when the lady said she would not read it, he did not, as most authors would of readers so unruly, despair of her. "It is a good sign," he wrote, "that you cannot read that book. The law is not made for the just man, and that book is not written for the children of the household. You have by grace what it has by reason." The number of requests made to him by authors of books, big and little, for prefaces, passport-letters in fact from Archbishop's House to the hearts of the faithful, was legion. But "Manning of Balliol found time for everything" to the very end. The bare list of publications bearing this *imprimatur* would fill columns. When he had to refuse, he did so with a gentleness which made even the refusal a favour. I heard both from the refuser and from the refused the story of one such episode. It was a pamphlet in which the zealous author undertook to prove from the Gospels the Pontiff's right to the temporal power. Said the author: "I have been to the Cardinal to ask him for a preface. I had written beforehand, sending the proofs; and, directly I got into the room, the Cardinal thanked me, and said, 'I have written a little on that subject myself, but you take a higher line.'" The narrator was so delighted, that he almost forgot he had come away without even the faintest hope of an Archiepiscopal preface. A day or two after, the Cardinal, not knowing I knew either of the applicant or his application, told me of both. "But," I said to him, 'stop a bit. I have written a little about that myself. But you overstep the line where I cannot follow you.'" This is what he meant to say—what, in effect, he said; for the preface was never written; but how much sensitive consideration framed the version he had provided for the eager author! The story is characteristic; and it supplies a key which was sometimes requisite to interpret and reconcile his speeches.

All sorts and conditions of women had recourse to him: the very simple, the very sophisticated. One of the first class, I remember, was a charming girl, who, though she thought "every one goes to Heaven, except, perhaps, people who steal," was not wholly happy in her Protestantism, and she asked the Cardinal to recommend her some daily spiritual exercise. "Say every day," he told her, "'Oh Lord, my heart is ready,' as the Psalmist says." She was anxious to do as directed, but she could not make up her mind whether she ought to say "as the Psalmist says" as part of her daily prayer; and I imagine her, in her scrupulousness, still giving Heaven the benefit of this piece of literary gossip! It is Lord Beaconsfield who speaks of a lady of gay celebrity putting off her cap and bells at his Eminence's feet; and there was truth behind the fiction. The routine of his life brought him into relation most often with the devout elderly lady—the mother of a flock, each one of whom the Cardinal-Archbishop would know by name, and be consulted about, as to the profession of Jack and the engagement of Jill. The experience was all the more vivid by contrast, when there came to him some great lady from the inner world of fashion, floating in a cloud of perfume, having first dropped from her hand the last French novel. The type startled him at first; but he, who was so ready to remind us that the habit did not make the monk, became equally persuaded that gay feathers did not mean a heart incapable of discipline, and that even heights of holiness could be spiritually attempted—though the outer foot wore the last vanity in shoes from the Burlington Arcade. No one—not Dr. Badenoch even—ever suspected His Eminence of using scent; but there came a time when I found twice or thrice in succession even the large rooms filled with perfumes of Piesse. A little later the conversion of a lady of fashion was announced. Never was passenger for St. Peter's bark in the hands of a more skilful pilot than was a great lady in the hands of this great man; and to his task he brought not merely skill but affection. Of these neophytes he spoke, if he spoke at all, with paternal tenderness. One such was so clever: she had written so sensibly and well—just a letter to announce her conversion to an illustrious personage, who suggested in reply that he saw behind hers an Eminent hand—"which was quite untrue," said the Cardinal, "though I own I may have changed a phrase here, or added a phrase there." I thought it was not a very bad instance, after all, of the illustrious personage's perception. Whatever the Cardinal's tact, it never hid the truth at any rate from the tactful. Generally he went straight to the mark. "I have been doing something you would not approve this afternoon, voting for the Marriage with the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill," said the Prince of Wales to him one evening. "I know you have, sir," said the Cardinal, not apologetically. "You disapprove that very much?" asked the Prince in appeasing tones. "I do, sir," was the straight reply.

Another type of woman had a great attraction for him—the Protestant young lady, whose piety has, more and more of late years, taken so practical a turn. He met, one after another, these maidens, each animated by a serious intention to make some one less wretched. A young man who had interested him, and who had two accidental associations with him—for he, too, was of Balliol, and his father lived in the house at Totteridge once occupied by the father of the Cardinal—fell ill, and his wife wrote to tell his Eminence. The aged man of eighty set out immediately to see the sufferer, a journey of an hour or two each way to a pasture of which he was not the spiritual shepherd. I happened to see him just after his return, and I cannot forget the glowing words he used of this Protestant lady—the daughter of a Scottish gentleman, who had left her home, he said, and had come to nurse in a London hospital for the sake of God and her fellow-creatures, and who had been married thence as if from her home. He said he thought all this self-denial wonderful in young women outside the Church. But the perfection of all womankind he found in his beloved neighbours, the Sisters of Charity, in Carlisle Place. Personally, he had not much sympathy with the contemplative Orders of either men or women. What captivated him most was the woman who worked in the world yet prayed in the cloister, who went about doing good—the leaven of holiness in the school and the slum. The Sisters of Nazareth came next in his affections; and of the Community at Hammersmith he said, wishing to cap my own praises, "They are unspoiled Irishwomen, and you cannot easily beat that." Those who are curious to know the Cardinal's preference in female beauty may care to hear that the only woman's face I ever heard him express an opinion on was that of "Princess T——" among Lenbach's fine portraits. I had turned over the leaves showing more brilliant beauties; but when we came to this he said: "That's pretty." I think it was because the lady has her eyes cast down. For equally ascetic reasons he liked the high foreheaded, colourless Madonnas better than all the mundane magnificences of Murillo.

In most questions his liberality was beyond expectation. He was never afraid of being compromised in the cause of charity. About Padre Curci, when he had been expelled by the Jesuits, and was even out of Papal favour, he once unbosomed himself to me. "I have put my purse at his disposal in his necessities," he said, "and I tell you this, that you may tell it when I am gone,"—a phrase which he not unfrequently used, and which I have regarded as an obligation in cases where, otherwise, my pen would run through passages. "They would burn him in Rome," he added, smiling, "if they could; and they would burn me too." An American lady, with a literary reputation less than her deserts—she, whose "Signor Monaldini's Niece" is among the few delightful contemporary novels—wrote another book in one of whose heroes the Cardinal recognised Padre Curci; and the portrait, though he thought it overdrawn, delighted him. He came upon it by a chance. Her books had been hailed, in a newspaper he was supposed to control, as a glory, where a glory was somewhat needed, to the Catholic literature of America; whereupon some one complained to the Cardinal, sending a copy of this particular book, with sentences carefully marked as certainly improper. "Profoundly pure," was His Eminence's verdict on the impeached passages. He heard occasionally of ladies whose lives were made a burden to them by horrors they sometimes listened to in sermons, and who were forbidden by confessors to hear them. "Has it come to that? Well, I do not wonder," he said. Fantastic sermons, which violate Gospel reserve, and which profess to reveal more of the mind of our Lord than did inspiration itself, were a great cross to him. "Poor things," he said once of a Community who had asked him to preach, and in whose tone he thought he perceived a certain sophistication; "I fear they were disappointed, for I found nothing better to preach about than the crucifixion." He had a great desire that his flock should love what he called "the music of the English Bible," and he published at his own cost St. John's

Gospel, in a form which made it available for the pocket. There was no medal or scapular which he regarded as an equipment more heavenly. He was less rigid in regard to trivial art in churches; I never heard him re-echo Savonarola's protest against the tawdry robes of crudest dye and the tinsel jewellery of the customary Madonna: "I tell you she went about dressed as a simple young woman." Yet Savonarola and he had most things in common; and they would not have differed so greatly either in the inventory of things to be heaped on the bonfire which the one lighted in Florence—and the other willingly would have lighted in Bond Street. One favourite phrase of his in certain of his moods was really a paraphrase from Savonarola: "In the catacombs the candlesticks were of wood, but the priests were of gold. Now the candlesticks are of gold." It was the more effective because the Cardinal left, as Savonarola did not leave, the antithesis to complete itself. It was by such phrases—slightly piquant, he knew them to be—that he kept his faithful clergy ever on their mettle.

The friendship between the Cardinal and Mr. Gladstone was characteristic of the eddies of both men's dispositions, and of the changes of the times. Begun at Oxford, where already both bore the mark of their predestination to greatness, and both had the profound impress of piety, it was continued through the years which saw Manning settle into Churchmanship, and Gladstone into Statesmanship—two *rôles* they might easily have interchanged. And when there came, in 1845, that crisis of the Anglican Church in the minds of a large group, the secession of Newman, it was Manning who preached to Gladstone the quieting doctrine that the freaks of individualism in her sons could not be pitted against the great corporate teaching of the mother Church of England. Perturbed in spirit, the politician left London behind him, and in the calm atmosphere of a Sussex rectory propounded this question: "Are all these conversions, capped by Newman's, so many separate testimonies to the truth of the Roman Church, or is there any one trait held by these men in common to account for their conversion?" "There *is* one trait," said the Archdeacon oracularly, "a want of truth." I tell the story as it was told to me. But it had an authentic sound to any one familiar with the ready-made-reason moods from which riper years did not wholly deliver him; and when I asked him, in the eighties, if it was true, he said that, though he had forgotten the words, they no doubt represented a general feeling he had that "Tract 90" was unstraightforward, and all these converts might, at a moment when the rising hope of the Church party needed a terse reply, be taken as tarred with the "Tract 90" brush. In 1889 I taxed Mr. Gladstone's memory as to the episode, but found it a blank until he heard the whole story, when the incident came back to him, except that he questioned the geography, thinking that it took place in London, not at Lavington. When Manning and Hope-Scott seceded together five years later, Gladstone said he felt as if he had lost his two eyes.

The Irish University question, which wrecked Mr. Gladstone's Bill in 1873, was the first great rock of offence set by circumstances between the two friends. For the Archbishop of Westminster was credited with influencing Irish and Catholic opinion, in and out of Parliament, to reject the proposals which, on the other hand, politicians of the Fawcett school attacked as concessions to Popery. Between the two stools the Minister of State fell, and when the Churchman and Statesman met in the street, one looked in another direction. The Statesman indited pamphlet after pamphlet to assert that the Vatican Council had tampered with the civil allegiance of Catholics, pamphlets in which it was so easy and pleasant to eulogise Newman, if only to set off a silence as to the merits of Manning. Even then, when Manning winced for the words of his friend, his thoughts went back affectionately and admiringly to the Gladstone of other days—the Gladstone of Christ Church, *sans peur et sans reproche*, the splendid type of all he most worshipped—talent and piety. "You surprise me," said Lord Beaconsfield, when Manning had been comparing the calm, broad, balanced Gladstone of that day and the Gladstone of later years; "I thought he had always been an Italian in the custody of a Scotchman." By the time Mr. Gladstone celebrated his eightieth birthday the Cardinal was able to write to him about the eighty stairs they had climbed together, a letter which had no hint of anything but the old trust and the old affection.

The temporary estrangement between the Cardinal and Mr. Gladstone was, as may be supposed, watched with some interest, and turned to some profit, by Lord Beaconsfield. The portrait of Cardinal Grandison in "Lothair" did not please its prototype. Very different, he thought, was the spirit shown in the delineation of the Archbishop of Tyre in "Endymion;" and there had been a good deal of communication between the novelist and the sitter during the interval between the two works. When asked by the Cardinal why he called himself a Tory, Lord Beaconsfield replied: "Because the word Conservative is so long."

And long—"the word is like a knell"—is the epithet which must already be applied to these Reminiscences. I, therefore, close, without exhausting, them. Fragmentary (his favourite word), unorganised as they are, they reveal points, in the temperament of this great Churchman, which could not be easily gathered from his formal writings or his official acts. He had a great desire to be known as he was; and those who possess broad human sympathies will not wonder at it; for there was nothing narrow or artificial in him. He was the exact contrary of what superficial bystanders represented him to be—the Marble Arch-(bishop) of profane jest. The most humble of men, he was not without an imperiousness all his own, which well became him. When he was eighty, letters of congratulation poured in upon him in varying keys of homage—all save one. His elder sister, who still thought of him only as a younger brother, wrote to remind him that not by the length of a man's years, but by the way they are spent, will he be judged in another world. "I hope I never forget that," said the Cardinal; "and yet what I have done is nothing, and I go empty-handed to my Redeemer." Only a little while before his death he told me of his sister's age—"ninety-three, and with all her faculties"—a welcome precedent. In his own unworldly way he loved the world and all the people in it. He did not want to die; but none was ever so submissive to the summons. "When you hear I have taken to my bed, you can order my coffin," he said to me; "in that I shall be like Lord Beaconsfield." Wearily and reluctantly he climbed the stone stairs for the last time, just after signing a business letter to the Vatican in the Italian he had economised time at Balliol by learning while he shaved. He had borne the burden of a long day; and he leaves a memory that must illuminate those who come after him in the work which remains for them to do.

WILFRID MEYNELL.

So great and humble a man as Cardinal Manning had necessarily a special side visible to each person who came in close contact with him, and even small contributions to a complete picture of him are not without value. I have been accustomed to think that he showed me a blithe and cosy human friendship which must have been rare. He treated me as a good old uncle might treat a niece whose ways were not his, but were interesting and entertaining to him, and merited his respect also. Anything further from the "contempt for women," which one or two rash newspaper correspondents have attributed to him, could not well have been imagined, than his gentle fun and serious help and advice. I grant, his advice was always given with an air of authority belonging to his position, but the authority vanished like a mist the moment it was not acknowledged, and he would add: "Am I not right? Don't you agree with me?" The fact is, his personal humility as a Christian man, his trained deference as an English gentleman, his devoted desire for the truth and the right, his sense of his ecclesiastical dignity and his firm stand on the Church's foundation, made a combination of perfect simplicity of manner, and left him free from personal considerations about himself, as well as about those with whom he was conversing. They were either souls needing his help, or fellow-workers consulting with him, and equal in view of the work. I suppose that few came into close relationship with him without finding that he felt it to be his duty to show them what he saw as truth; but, so far as I know, he was content not to try to impose himself on their convictions. He gave me the impression that liberality as to others was as strong as conviction for himself. He even had a certain amused sense of the horror in which he knew himself and his Church to be held by people for whom he had respect.

My personal knowledge of Cardinal Manning dates only a few years back. I was in London about a case of peculiarly insolent ruffianism on the part of a bad man. His crime could not be punished by law, nor by publicity; but it went hard with me that it should pass quite scot-free. My usual counsellors were far away, and I went to the Cardinal to see what he thought could be done. I proposed a certain course. We talked the case over, and then the Cardinal said: "I don't know *you*. I don't know whether you have courage to do it. I don't know whether you will do it well." I said I had courage, and would take his suggestions as to how to do it. He said: "Well. Let us talk about other things, and then we'll see." And for an hour or so we talked about common friends, about modes of work for the troubled, and about non-personal religious topics. I had known so much of him through others, that I was not surprised to find how sweetly, genially humorous he was—in fact, half-chaffing on some subjects, while burning with indignation on others. He finally said: "I think you can do this, and I think it will be a good thing to do. God bless you. Take this blessing, at least, as the blessing of an old man." I think his rich and beautiful voice almost always sounded in the ears of a departing visitor: "Come and see me again." He loved to have people come to him for advice and help, and perhaps loved it most keenly if he knew that they were stepping across some barrier. He certainly stepped across many a barrier to meet me, as he always did, after that first time. I carried out the plan, pleased him, and he wrote to me: "What you did was contrary to the prudence of this world, but in accordance with the prudence of the next. Good will come of it; at all events, a voice has spoken to him in God's name, and His word does not return void. For the present, what you have done is enough."

I did not see him again for some time, and when I went I shall never forget his appearance as he came in. His attendant, Newman, always confused me with another lady, and I suppose he had taken in no clear message as to who I was. The old man came in, holding one side of his long coat across his chest, drawn up to his full height, and looking as severe and distant as could be. He was a mediæval ecclesiastic all over. But when I made a few steps forward to meet him, face and figure all relaxed, and smiling, he said: "Oh! it's *you*, is it? Well? What mischief is on foot to-day? What commands have you for me?" At the end of my business he said: "Have you seen So-and-so (a recent 'vert to the Catholic Church) lately?" I said I had, and that I was charmed to see what his Christianity could do for an Agnostic. "Yes, that is a true conversion. That is a true conversion—a conversion as you Methodists understand it, too." And presently he seemed to think this was his first good chance with me, and said, "And when are you coming nearer?" "I am not likely ever to come nearer in the sense I think you mean," I said; and he urged on me the benefits of confession. I must say that I did little but parry the attack, because I could not bring myself to say plainly what I thought. He seemed too good and gentle to be opposed. But he gave me a book of his, and asked me to discuss it with him later on. The next time he saw I was unwilling, and said nothing till we had said good-bye. Then came a pause, and "Well?" I said, "No. I only came to you for the business we have settled." "Very well, very well. But you know you need guidance." I avoided the whole question, and for a time or two he left all such personalities alone. Then he gave me a little book on the Office of the Holy Spirit, and pressed me for comments on it. At last I frankly told him that his dignity and kindness about other things made it painful to speak plainly, but that I agreed with his book as far as he could quote Scripture in support of his teaching, but that he presently came to his doctrine of the Church, and had no quotations, and that then I differed. He said gently, "You do not see your need of confession and of the Church, but it is there," I said, "No. You suggest to me means by which to get what I have already, peace with God through Jesus Christ, and access to God by the Holy Spirit. You have really nothing better to offer me. And I can say this freely to you because you understand life as no ordinary priest can. You have lived a complete life, and understand. You know that I have all I need." He said quickly, with a sharp look at me, "Are you content with yourself, then?" Of course I said no, but with the faith and doctrine I had received. And I added again: "You *know* I have what satisfies my soul's needs." He paused, nodded his head repeatedly, and then said: "I know that I think that you would always follow the truth." I said, "More than that. You know that I see the truth differently from you, and that I have what satisfies me, while you have what satisfies you. Forgive me; I must speak plainly when you press me." He turned to me, and said very solemnly: "The Church has a doctrine of the intention of the heart. You have that intention of the heart. God bless you, God bless you." Then he reverted to the practical business result we had previously come to, and sent two or three messages by me to fellow-workers.

He used, with a smile, to ask me about the health of a lady of his own age whom he knew to be an anxiously zealous Protestant, and sent messages which I durst not deliver. I always felt his quiet, underlying sense of Christian fellowship with her to be strong, though he knew that to her he represented "the Scarlet Woman" in England.

Perhaps one of the most amusing conversations I ever had with him was after I had seen some evictions in Ireland, and had made friends with some priests over there. I went to tell him all about it, and he spoke with great warmth of appreciation about the English Protestants who had been over to cheer the hearts of the Irish. I said it was strange that English Catholics did not go. He said they were not in sympathy. I asked why he did not tell them to go, since it must stir their sympathy. "They *won't* go,"—he repeated again and again;—"it's no use. They won't go." "Then," I said, "why don't you tell their confessors to send them for penance?" He laughed heartily, lifted his hands, and let them fall on his knees: "A capital idea! I will," he said.

I have been struck with his readiness to do things which a man of his age, to say nothing of his dignity, would not generally do. He would get up and go and put a little coal on the fire, saying, "We shall get quite cold sitting talking here." He gave me a delightful sense of enjoying the not being on ceremony or professional with me. After that one frank talk, he seemed to feel homeish and chatty, and never again did more than give me a little book and bless me. I once urged him to express publicly his opinion on a matter on which he felt bound to silence almost complete. He said, "You understand I am tied and pledged." I said, "It is of great importance. Can you say nothing more?" He said, "Well, what could I say? What do you think I could say?" I suggested one thing after another that seemed to me possible. "No, no." Till, at last, I got a phrase which he felt would do, and he said, "Now, you must be quiet and content with that. I can go no further. I am bound."

Last summer I thought that in his remarks on the Encyclical he had fallen into the almost universal clerical error of laying the burden of parental responsibility on mothers. I wrote to him, saying plainly that I thought that the clergy generally said this sort of thing naturally, because if they returned to the earlier doctrine that it is incumbent on fathers to teach their children as they walk in the way, they would have to practise what they preached, and society pressed in the opposite direction. I begged him, from his freer position, to set the example of a better doctrine, and to try to stir fathers up to do their share. I told him I despaired of true doctrine until women took their place in pulpits and on platforms. He quickly replied:

> "I began reading your letter without knowing from whom it came, and I said to myself, 'Heyday, here is a fine lady scolding! I wonder who it is.' I then looked at the end, and wondered no longer.
>
> "What can be more unjust than you?
>
> "I was writing not against the women, but against employers. Mothers are partly driven into work, as you say, by the selfishness of fathers and the temptation of employers.
>
> "What have I been doing for twenty years but preaching to fathers, in pledging them to total abstinence from drink, and in binding them to spend all they earn on their homes, by which the mothers can live a domestic life? Even the context of what you quote contains all this. But you ladies are torpedoes, and not legislators or preachers.
>
> "There! I have had my revenge.
>
> "But how can our people have homes until the land laws and the house property laws have been revised?
>
> "I hope you are getting a good holiday."

I was, of course, much delighted with this letter, but it turned out that he was just as much pleased with it as I. I went to call on him with a friend who wanted to be introduced to him, and he came into the room where we had waited, holding out both hands, and saying eagerly, "Did you get my letter? What did you think of it?" I told him I had been charmed by it, though I did not think it an answer. He at once began, chuckling, to explain the controversy to my friend, and was quite full of amusement. Our errand was to ask him to write a paper for the *Review of the Churches*, on re-union, and my friend was going about the matter diplomatically; but as soon as he saw what it was, he at once said, "I should like to write on that for you." Then he talked earnestly on the subject, quoting a correspondence with an Anglican clergyman, who had said that Anglican clergy would be able to join the Roman Catholic Church, if she would recognise their orders, dispense with celibacy, and—I forget the third point. "That's rather a large order. It's asking a *good* deal," he said.

He ended a conversation that was hurried, because he had a bishop waiting for him, by repeating his invariable line of talk on this subject, to the effect that formal union was far off, and that one could not see how it is to come, but that united work for the objects we can see alike upon is the true road to the end, as it is the only practical way of expressing our desires for unity. He welcomed any union among the sects as a sign of a deep desire for union, and as a promise for the future of the whole Church.

Like all who came in contact with him, I feel myself to have parted temporarily from one of my dearest friends, but only as friends part to live in different countries. It is such child-like souls as his really was that make almost visible to one the family life of heaven and earth as one and undivided. He had thought the Father's command was to obey a Church without questioning its authority, and he acquiesced like a child. His deepest sympathies seemed to me always to be for untaught and neglected children. If this seems to leave out of sight the "astute Churchman" view of him, I can only say that there is no diplomacy like perfect simplicity, and that always has seemed to me to be his diplomacy.

SARAH M. SHELDON AMOS.

SEVEN and a half years ago—through a work in which we were both specially interested, the children's sections of the Criminal Law Amendment Act—I first came to know the great man who has just left a church without its brightest ornament, and a country without one of its noblest sons, and whose life has been to me ever since that day like some beautiful sacred song. I had been warned against him by a valued friend as "the prince of proselytisers," and had a strong constitutional and principled dislike to his Church, and at least very negative feelings towards ecclesiastics in general; and now I met the man. "Well," said he, almost swinging his hand into the grasp of mine, "you are going to work for suffering children; God bless and help you!" His princedom in his church, his long black crimson-edged cassock, his crimson tiara, his cross of gold, his intellect and learning, his history, were all lost in a sweetness and sanctity which I had never met before save in humanity's holiest, most perfect childhood. His sacred seriousness, his spontaneous delight, his absorption in what I had to say, his intense righteousness, the evident aims with which he lived, the human warmth and colour which illuminated every feature of his wonderful face possessed me with liberty and joy in his presence. I had but one thought in coming away from him:—the splendour of a true man. He was the man who is man's instinctive choice. Often have I seen him since that day, but neither then nor at any subsequent visit to him did I ever for one moment feel that I was in the presence of a great ecclesiastic—much less of a little one. There were such persons hung in painting upon his walls. The intense simplicity of his nature, together with the extraordinary vastness of the sphere of its sympathies, pities, and solicitudes, constituted that same kind of dignity, that pure majesty, which compelled the child of Heth, "even the children of Heth," to answer Abraham, saying, "Hear us, my lord: thou art a mighty prince among us."

He was a king. His robes and jewels, and shields and heraldry, and tower of strength were that his great mind and heart went out to his race. He was at the summit of all the humanity you had known. Your reverence for him sprang from the glimmer of himself in you. There was a deep, tender fear in it which was akin to worship, and which tended to make men of no religion and men of every variety of religion kneel for his blessing as Jacob's sons knelt for Jacob's.

To this personality was added the subtle suggestion of his coming to you from a still larger world than the vast world of men. In all his bearing was the saying: "I am a stranger and sojourner with you." He was a son of the living God and Father of all. Men, rude and refined, of his Church, of no Church, and of all Churches, while revering and loving him for himself, had their unbelief put a little to shame, or their faith gladdened, by the subtle, luminous power in which his strong, clear faith and joy in his God and theirs, bathed him, and, for the moment, them. They had seen none such wonderful manhood. The sense of eternal things which filled his presence men, to their surprise, felt in a degree haunting themselves. They had glimmers of a nimbus around his venerable head which made them, perhaps, dimly understand why painters had gilded aureoles around the heads of those saints which hung upon his walls.

Yet not the humblest docker, not the youngest child, not the hardest unbeliever, found in him any "greatness," as earth's great personages are great. He had the gentleness, the deference of a father pitying his children. He was aware not in the least that he was a Cardinal-Archbishop: to be of service to you seemed the special object of his life. It was thus that "My son," as he used to address an earnest man, seemed so well to become his lips. Yet was his pleasure in his service so child-like, that his heart seemed to bound and sing with the enjoyment of the thought that he could be anything of a helper to the helpless among men.

From first to last my acquaintance with him was almost wholly in his relation to suffering children. I am fain to think that, as their friend, he loved me. It was in those years when the need of the Society for whose existence I worked—The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children—was still unrecognised, whilst its success was still doubtful, whilst its proposals for legislation were generally resented as "grandmotherly," its statements of reasons for such legislation "sensational" and "hysterical," whilst national opinion upon its existence and aims was adverse or dead—it was then that Cardinal Manning allowed me to find in him a friend, and made me feel the strength which comes from such a man's homage to one's cause. By a true instinct he rejected alike the doubts and the censures which at that time were almost universal, and in various and subtle ways, by sacred sympathy and encouragement, and by a wide and statesmanlike view of the matter, sustained the faith and zeal necessary if the cause was not to prove too great and die. When urging patience in those days, the Cardinal said in his own persuasive way: "Child life and home-life have not been thought about in England. We have to make them thought about. The age is busy and superficial. Such work will take time. Nothing that a nation needs deeply does it suddenly espouse." At another moment of disappointment he said to the same worker: "There is room for only one true fear in a man. That fear is that he may be wrong. When that has been banished, there is no room for any other." Whenever he observed in the paper that either I or the Society had had a snub, he was sure to send a little note, "Come and see me." On one occasion he said, referring to a case which had recently been dismissed by the Westminster magistrate: "Nothing is more to be dreaded in a work like this than that we should allow the weaknesses of human agencies to divert our attention from the righteousness of our mission. And do remember," he added, "that magistrates cannot be expected to administer the law beyond the requirements of public sentiment. Nothing is so likely to make an earnest man unjust to officials as that he should be disheartened. St. Paul could work for his Lord, and yet respect the officials whose duty it was to send him to prison." When the first essay was made to interest the thinking part of the nation in the cruelties from which so many of its children suffered, he joined with me, a comparatively unknown man, in writing an article in this Review, thus lending the influence of his great name to a cause as yet unpopular. When the Bill for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was before Parliament, he went down to the House twice to use his influence in the lobby with some of the members he knew, from whom, he feared, support for it was not probable. To the same influence the Society owes some of its most influential supporters. To its two last annual meetings he promised to come if his doctor would permit him to do so. The previous winters had both been spent indoors. When the time for the meetings came he was still unwell. On one occasion, when urged to go and winter in the South of France, and follow the good example of Mr. Spurgeon, he said: "When my Father opens His door, and wants Henry Edward Manning within, shall the child not be waiting on the step?"

His interest in children was like his character—an all-round one and of the most genuine and simple kind. "I like to go into the parks on Sunday," he said on one occasion, "to see the children and talk with them; and I give them my blessing." Then, with a pleased smile he added: "Nobody can say that I am proselytising in that." Referring on one occasion to a depressed remark I had made to him on the small results of the past year's work: "Only seventy cases!" he exultingly exclaimed. "Small result! Think of seventy little children's tears dried, and seventy little children's pains stopped! We can never say that that is nothing. It is glorious!" In a still more solemn voice, he continued: "A child's needless tear is a blood blot upon this earth." A worker for the Society, after a tour in Ireland, called upon him at his request to tell him the result. On hearing that the Catholic priest and the treasurer of the Irish Church Missionary Society, Parnellite and McCarthyite, Orangeman and Home Ruler, had met together on our platform, and had joined in forming our Aid Committees, he clapped his hands and exclaimed: "How happy the old prophet would have been! The good days are coming. It is the little child that will be their leader. People will find their brotherhood in little children."

What this great man did for suffering children he could not help doing. The sinister motives which have been attributed to him by persons who did not know him are to me, who have had the privilege of his intimacy for seven and a half years, unjust and impossible. His zealous Roman Catholicism was but the image and superscription of that pure golden humanity, to which each needless tear of a child was a blood-drop. With the ecclesiastical kingdom to which he gave his allegiance I have no concern here. Before all things he was a grandly human being. To him the cause and service of the little and weak was what to too many ecclesiastics is the cause and service of the great and the strong. Whatever was his own desire in the matter, the power of his life served, not Romanism, but religion. It was in spite of his alien Church, alien in name and in habits of thought to English life, that he won Englishmen's love. They travelled after him, led by his personality, not by his creed. The English are first political, then religious; and all their political traditions, as well as all the institutions their politics have created, place a bar against Romanism, which no personality, however great, can remove.

His influence was like that gracious influence of a noble woman which all men feel without becoming women, or even adopting their costume. It was created and it was limited by what in him was common to our best humanity, and which every human being by virtue of humanity must feel. The Church to which he belonged gave him titles; but these, though extending the range and opportunities of the fascination of his influence, did not constitute the source of it. Neither the mitre nor the crown, but the common heart of mankind transfigured, marks the true master of men. The Pope may create twenty cardinals; he cannot create one Manning, for grand titles do not make grand men. A bishop's throne may have a bishop's empire, but only a bishop's. Manhood alone can have empire over men.

Though most of what he said to me was said to make my hands stronger to do the special work I had to do, and which, had he had time, his own hands would have gladly done, now and again conversation slipped into more general topics, when, so utterly simple was he and so open, that what some would call the trifles of his personal life would come up in his conversation, which all unconsciously betrayed how full of happy and prosperous virtue he was. On one occasion he told me this story in slow periods, in which every word was a reality: "I was going down that street," pointing out of the window to a double row of mansions that were being built, "and I met a little boy going along his happy way, with poor dress, but a lovely, thoughtful, pale, open face, and I stopped him for the pleasure of speaking to him. 'Well, my little man, how are you, and where are you going with that little bundle in your hand?' He told me 'there'—pointing to one of the houses being built, 'to his father.' 'What is your father?' I asked. 'A carpenter, sir,' he replied." Then the Cardinal added slowly, "I was awed and startled! I had met a carpenter's son! My Lord was once a little servant like that boy. Oh, Mr. Waugh," he exclaimed, almost in tears, "what depths of love were in Christ!" He then in the simplest way disclosed that he had at once returned home and sent all that he had then to give to some institution for the children of the poor. "I feel at times," he said, "ashamed to own anything." I saw in that moment how intense upon him was the power of the life of our Lord.

Never was a man less of a bigot. He had a heart for all reality. We differed *toto cœlo* in our ideas of the Church. As the name is generally understood, I had no Church. The source of my religion began and ended with the Nazarene. I had no Church history, no Church creeds, save the history once enacted in Galilee and Judea and the creed of the Gospels. The four lives of the Nazarene by four of his friends were my library of faith. My pope, my cardinals were, therefore, Christ and his Twelve. My apostolical succession was to such men as had by direct contact with our Lord caught some of His holy fire. On one occasion when I had respectfully put my position to him he said: "Well, you are making me your confessor, and I give you absolution, for you need it; you are not following Christ as much as you think you are. Follow Him enough and you will find that out."

When walking in the New Forest some years ago I came up, here and there upon the road, with little knots of country people in their Sunday best wending their way to a village church. They were going, I found, to the funeral of "the housekeeper at the Hall." I turned into the church, attended the service, and followed to the grave. I did not know the woman, but I found that she had been greatly loved and was bitterly mourned by the whole country side, which had ceased labour and gathered to weep at her grave. Humanity mourned when she died. I found myself joining in its tears. When the lingering company had gone away, I said to the gravedigger: "She was much beloved, it seems." "Ah, sir!" he sobbed with difficulty, his aged, wrinkled face crumpling up as fresh tears started, breaking his sentence. Then taking his shovel, he continued, as he began to shovel back the earth: "This is the hardest job I've had for many a day."

Those Hebrew "women from Galilee" and those English labourers from the Forest had the same kind of reason for their tears at the tomb. Humanity wept at both. And it was humanity that wept at the tomb of the Cardinal. Our common race was bereaved. The mystic power of man "renewed after the image of Christ" is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Remembering the great woe of this great city and of the whole land at his grave it is well to reflect that though place and power play their part in this complex life of ours, empire belongs only to Christ and to the Christ-like soul, be its circle great or small. It is not an Atlantic alone that possesses the properties of the sea; each wave and ripple breaking around the children's feet paddling upon its shore possesses the same. Its very spray is salt. Nor is it greatness of name and vastness of sphere that constitute the power of a Christian. His power is that his nature is impregnated with the race-loving spirit of Christ. The soul may be as unconscious of its properties as the sea is of its properties, but it has them all the same; and by whatsoever Church-name that soul is known: Greek, Roman, or Anglican, be it a diocesan dignitary, or a "housekeeper at the Hall" among farms and labourers, the Christliness of its disposition and behaviour will be the measure in which men will find in it "saving health."

Once I was warned by a well-known statesman against putting ecclesiastics on my Society's committee. I said: "But we have already one on it, Cardinal Manning." His reply was: "Oh, Manning, he is not an ecclesiastic; he belongs to us all!"

That the supremest humanity is king among men, this is the lesson of the great life which the nation mourns, and which it will see no more.

BENJAMIN WAUGH.

I CANNOT refrain from adding to the foregoing papers a few recollections of my own. For some years past I have, like many others, been admitted to Cardinal Manning's friendship, and found ready access to him. Many an hour's conversation I have had with him—often on a Sunday evening, when he seemed to be at leisure for general and discursive talk. Several friends, notably Dr. Paton and the late Dr. Hatch, I have had the pleasure of making known to him; for he seemed desirous of meeting every one worth knowing. He never tried to convert me: indeed we did not go much into ecclesiastical argument; recognising our different points of view, we were ready to discuss the secondary questions on which differences are not vital. I remember that early in our acquaintance the Cardinal, who had undertaken to write an article for this REVIEW on the question of the admission of Mr. Bradlaugh to the House of Commons, sent to ask me to go down and talk to him about it. I found him with the MS. just finished, the sheets scarcely dry. He read over the whole to me, challenging me to concur with, or dissent from, each proposition, and breaking into a gentle smile when—as was generally the case—I intimated strong dissent. I thought the article very good as a statement of opinion, but untenable as an argument.

I once congratulated him on his long life, as giving time for his motives and career to display themselves in their true light. He assented, referring very feelingly to the unpopularity and misconception he had had to go through; how he had been under a cloud for twenty or thirty years, but had in the end lived through it.

I have never met with any one who seemed to me a more thorough Bishop; not merely carrying with sedulous attention and grave responsibility, though with a masterful sense of certainty and ease, the cares of his own diocese and Church, and—to his own feeling at least—of the religion of his country, but always ready to undertake the guidance of any individual soul in need, caring for the one, and lavish of thought and time in each case—a confessor as well as an overseer. He meditated deeply on the state of Christianity in England—of course with à bias; thought highly, on the whole, of the aristocracy, spoke often in words of solemn warning of the perils of our pursuit of money, but recognised the deep-seated belief in God of the bulk of the people. There was much Catholic truth, he would say, among the Methodists, and he held that the Salvation Army, sadly defective as it was, was nevertheless seriously preaching the fear of God.

I was abroad during the early part of the Dock strike. On returning, I went to see the Cardinal, who told me what he had been doing. I suggested that the Bishop of London, having put his hand to the plough, had looked back. "Yes," he said, with a sort of wicked smile, "and I am not sure whether any other of my episcopal brethren were in England at the time."

Some years ago Dr. Fairbairn, of Mansfield College, wrote some articles criticising the theological position of Cardinal Newman. Cardinal Manning, reading these, spoke to me of his great interest in them, and expressed a wish to meet Dr. Fairbairn. Accordingly, he came to my house one afternoon to meet Dr. Fairbairn and my friend Dr. Paton. Mr. Lilly was also present, and some members of my family. After tea the conversation naturally turned on the Roman Catholic question, and in the most friendly and generous spirit, as might be expected from the temper of the men, a general argument of the deepest interest was held, Dr. Fairbairn propounding questions to bring out the points, the Cardinal replying, and Dr. Paton interposing remarks and questions now and then. The Cardinal did not bind himself to Cardinal Newman's positions, and indeed expressly disclaimed to have so studied his books as to know his views ; but he treated the belief in God as a necessity of his existence, and deduced from it the belief in Christianity—*i.e.*, the Catholic Church. His argument was, to the minds of some present, somewhat out of date, founded rather on the lines current in the Tractarian times than on those which are adjusted to modern history and philosophy. But he more than frankly admitted to saving grace Christians outside the Roman Catholic Church, basing his view on the doctrine of extraordinary grace, the result of the grace of the Church, and shining out beyond her pale. The whole conversation was strenuous ; Drs. Fairbairn and Paton, both coming, as they explained, of the blood of the Covenanters, were firm, though fraternal, themselves holding High Church doctrine, though of a different order. I remember especially one passage. The Cardinal was asked to define the specific Roman Catholic theory of the Church, and, settling himself to the task, spoke for two or three minutes. At the close of his sentences we all three, with one voice, accepted his definition absolutely. This may show either the underlying similarity of Christian creeds or the difficulties of definition ; but it was very striking. There was no difference as to the ideas of the Church and Catholicity ; only as to the realities which corresponded to them. The conversation was at last broken off by the Cardinal having to leave. Rising from his chair, he grasped Dr. Fairbairn by the hand, and, with the greatest warmth, said how glad he was, in spite of what he must consider imperfections, to be able to recognise him as a brother in Christ. Dr. Fairbairn, with like feeling, replied how happy he was to be able so to regard him, without even speaking of imperfections, and even happier to be in a position to acknowledge him as a teacher called to his office, like himself, by the Master, and possessed therefore of the same right to serve Him. It was a mutual benediction, and a scene I shall never forget. P. W. B.

THE CHURCH AND LABOUR PROBLEMS.

BY THE BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD, SIR JOHN GORST, THE WARDEN OF TOYNBEE HALL, REV. H. T. SMART, MR. BEN TILLETT.

From *The Review of the Churches* (London), January, 1892.

I.

THE BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD.

No one can have lived eight and a half years in East London, as I have done, without learning (if he ever required to learn) to take the deepest and keenest interest in the labour problems with which he is daily confronted there. Indeed, the interest is more than deep and keen ; it is full of pain and distress. For no one can know, even superficially, the state of things in such a region, and rest satisfied. To witness the scenes at the dockyard gates, in the casual wards of the workhouses, in the lower class of lodging-houses, and in the very streets and courts of the poorer districts, is to be constantly asking oneself, Can this be right? Is this the best we can do? Is there no way of bettering these dreary lives, and bringing hope to these hopeless ones? Of course the misery and destitution in parts of our great cities present only one of the many problems which touch the great labour question. But it is the problem which most forces itself upon any one conversant with the darker aspects of life. And we dare not let things alone. I do not mean that it would be dangerous to society and to the peace and order of the realm to let things alone (though it would be), but we dare not, because conscience will rise up and condemn us if we do, because our hearts bleed with compassion for these poor sufferers, because we believe that Christ came to bring light and blessing to man, and bids us help one another. I suppose, whenever we speak of the want and suffering in such a district as East London, there are sure to be some to say our pity is misplaced, for these sufferers have brought their suffering upon themselves by vice and idleness and improvidence. No doubt they have in many cases, though the latest statistics go to show that the larger share of the poverty and helplessness of the aged poor is due, not to drunkenness, as has often been affirmed, but to sickness and old age. Still, no doubt drunkenness has a terribly large share in the matter, while inveterate indolence accounts for another large proportion, improvidence being common enough as a contributory cause in most cases. But I am not able to regulate my compassion by the deserts or non-deserts of the objects presented to it. I do not feel as if I should care to be dealt with myself exactly according to my deservings. Besides, if sickness and poverty are piteous things, so most assuredly is sin. I quite allow that when a man is suffering from the results of ingrained evil habit, or of vicious living, it is exceedingly hard to help him. General Booth thinks he can rescue and restore him, and we watch his ambitious experiments with great interest and sympathy, if with some misgivings as to the results. But, even if much less than some sanguine temperaments may hope is all that can be done for an adult generation, even a little is well worth doing, and for my part I cannot imagine a Church, commissioned to preach a Gospel to the poor, indifferent to the problems, (difficult though they may be, hopeless of solution though they may seem to some,) concerned with the startling inequality in the distribution of wealth and comfort, and the general raising of the condition of the poorest class of labourers.

Of course it is very obvious that our hope lies greatly in training up a new generation to higher and nobler conceptions of life, and to a more vigorous self-dependence, than the generation that has matured its habits and outlived its ambitions. And here there are problems which appeal in the directest fashion to all Christian people. Even the very compassion which is an inheritance of human nature is enough, apart from higher motives, to make us seek very earnestly to save the young from the dangers to which the old have been exposed, and to educate them to be a happiness to themselves and an honour to their country. Dr. Barnardo, whether we like his system or not, has set us a grand example; and the Church of England has taken up in good earnest, and with wonderful success, the work of rescuing the waifs and strays from their perilous surroundings, and training them to pure and honest living.

These are comparatively simple problems to deal with compared with many others. What shall we say of trades unions, labour disputes, and strikes? Well, I have in one way given my answer long ago, for I was for several years before I went as Bishop to East London a member of a "Church and Trades Union Council," which existed in order that Churchmen might show that they did not join in the sweeping condemnation of trades unions, which was not uncommon, but that they welcomed the elements of good in such combinations, strongly supported the right of the working classes to combine for protection and promotion of their own interests, and desired that these societies should not be looked upon as out of the sphere of Christian motive and principle. I know very well how foolish it is for clergymen, or indeed any persons not thoroughly well-informed in the details of the questions raised, to interfere in trade disputes. These questions are generally very complicated and difficult. But sometimes it is pretty obvious that there is something very wrong which needs amending, as in the first dock-labourers' strike, and then the sympathies of the Church should go, as they did go very freely in East London, with the men who were seeking relief. In the same way there was great sympathy on the part of the Church with the match-girls and their hardships, though we are bound to confess that the swift and satisfactory remedy of their grievances was due to one with whose views in some matters the Church cannot profess much sympathy—I mean Mrs. Besant. I am afraid *we* were talking while *she* was acting. I suppose there is a far fairer and juster view taken of strikes now than a short time ago. Very few would deny that they are, though a rough remedy, at times fully justified, and often really beneficial. Nor does any one deny the often splendid self-sacrifice which accompanies them on the part of individuals, and this independently of the goodness or badness of the cause. The working classes have certainly shown great power of endurance and of discipline, as well as of self-denial, and the Church must at least honour these virtues.

From the subject of strikes and combinations it is natural to pass to that of co-operative industries. I do not care to say anything about co-operative *distribution*, because that has well established itself, and can take care of itself. Besides it does not seem to me to have any very lofty end and aim, unless encouragement of thrift be such. But in co-operative *production* I have long seen much hope of some solution, even if only a partial one, of the great problems as to the proportionate interests of producer and consumer, and as to the relative power and duty of capital and labour. I am aware of the difficulties besetting such schemes, and of the causes leading to frequent failure. But all such schemes do not fail, and I have visited and addressed the men at a large mill that has grown and thriven for many years, and is at present in a thoroughly sound and prosperous condition, conducted on the strictest profit-sharing principles, and with no large capital as a foundation; while every one knows the wonderful success of various continental experiments, and notably that of Leclaire in Paris. I certainly hold that the Church should take a keen and intelligent interest in such efforts as these. If our workers think that the Church cares little for their earthly welfare, they are not likely to be much attracted by her spiritual claims. I am sure that the questions now agitated as to old age pensions, namely, whether the provision be made by the earnings of the pensioners when young, or by taxation of the whole people, and, if the former, whether voluntary or compulsory, are questions which ought to be full of interest to Christian people, who wish to be like their Master, and to care, as He cared, for the poor and needy.

And then we come to the wilder dreams of the Socialist. I dare not speak hard things of him. God knows there is excuse enough for him. There are times when, being brought face to face with some of the saddest and darkest aspects of life, one is tempted to welcome any scheme, however ill-conceived or impracticable, which might give even a chance for the bettering of what is so terribly bad. But one thing is very certain, namely, that all great and beneficent social advances are of slow growth, and that it is madness to hope (as some do) for any real amelioration of the conditions of labour or of society from sudden and subversive change. There are laws of economics, however little some may regard them in these days, which are too strong for the struggles of revolutionists, and which will take a sure vengeance for a temporary defeat. We might as well expect an earthquake to ripen our harvest as a social cataclysm to bring happiness and well-being to our people. We must work with, and not against, the great laws which are intertwined inextricably with all our vast and complicated social system. It seems to me that even if, by some strange combination of political and social forces, the ideas of the Socialists could be embodied in legislative enactment, they must at once collapse and fall into ruin, except upon the condition of the universal acquisition of such honesty, honour, truthfulness, and self-effacement, as the world is alas! a very long way from realizing at present. When mankind is thoroughly Christianized, the Socialist schemes may be conceivably possible; but when that happy consummation is achieved I much doubt whether they will be any longer considered necessary.

It will be seen, by the brief and imperfect treatment of the subject which the space assigned to me necessitates, that I have myself, and consider that the Church at large ought to have, great sympathy with all problems that affect the temporal well-being of the working classes. I believe that this is right and good in itself. But I believe also that in numberless cases the only way to inspire a belief that you are honestly anxious to do good and to help in the highest and best way is to show that you are honestly anxious to help in those matters which to *us* may appear lower and of minor importance, but to those we are thinking of seem for the most part the one thing needful. I deprecate once more *meddling* where we are not experts. I am sure much harm is done by ignorant assumption of knowledge or authority. But I am quite sure of this—that the great duty of the Church at all times and in all cases is to set forth and enforce high and holy principles and motives. I am quite sure one is bound to point out that Christianity is meant to govern all spheres and phases of life; and that religion is not a thing concerned only with Prayer, Bible-reading, and Churchgoing, but is a thing for strong men to take with them into all the business and work and trials and temptations of their daily life. I am quite sure it is not unnecessary to remind people that even corporate action is bound to submit to Christian principle, and that bodies of men and separate classes can be, and often are, unjust, uncharitable, and selfish, even when the individual members of such bodies or classes are themselves in their personal character and conduct just and generous. I desire to see Christianity more and more inter-penetrating the whole life of the nation, and I do not think the Church ought to be satisfied until social and political problems are handled and treated upon Christian principles, and in obedience to the laws of God. Above all, I hold that the old golden rule, to do to others as we would they should do to us, should bear sway in all things. We may boast of our freedom; and may God preserve it to us. We may be a strong and united people; and God save us from disunion and discord. We may advance in all culture and amenity of living; and God make the lives of our people fairer and happier. But, after all, it is "righteousness which exalteth a nation."

WM. WALSHAM WAKEFIELD.

II.

SIR JOHN GORST.

IN his character sketch for December, Mr. Stead, in the *Review of Reviews,* opens with the remarkable statement that after Lord Salisbury and his nephew, Mr. Balfour, Sir John Gorst is the most considerable member of the Conservative party, although by a curious irony of fate he is not even now a member of the Cabinet. There are few on the Conservative benches, and none at all on the Liberal side of the House, who do not recognise that in the next Parliament, and still more in the Parliament after the next, Sir John Gorst will be only second to Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons. Later on in the sketch he speaks of the summoning of the Labour Conference by the German Emperor at Berlin, to which Sir John Gorst was accredited as the first British delegate, and says that it was a post for which he was eminently qualified, and it opened opportunities of which he was not slow to take advantage. Sir John's sympathies have always been democratic, and he endeavoured so far as he could to second the efforts of the German Emperor in the amelioration of the condition of the toilers of Europe.

When, therefore, the above subject had been selected for the fourth Round Table Conference of this REVIEW, I naturally turned to Sir John Gorst to obtain the views of a practical politician upon the influence which the Church of Christ ought to exert in the endeavour to solve the many problems created by the labour movements of the day. Sir John Gorst kindly granted me an interview at once, but immediately after I had opened the conversation said, "It is difficult for me as a member of the Government to take part in any debatable question. Several of my friends complained a good deal about the interview which Mr. Stead has had with me on the Labour Question in February last, and afterwards published. Moreover, I have no wish to play the part of a judge with respect to the duty of the clergy—they understand their work a great deal better than I possibly can do. The question indeed is a very varied one, as to the relation which the minister of religion should take up with respect to the social questions of the day. A great deal depends upon how long a parson has been amongst his people. If he has been with them twenty or thirty years, and by faithful service has gained their respect and devotion, he can speak with respect to the living issues of the day in a manner which would not be tolerated or tolerable in a young curate, who had but recently come amongst the people. Then, again, a great deal must depend upon the character of the people who make up the congregation. If they are ignorant, the clergyman may be well advised in giving them very clear and defined teaching with respect to questions of political and social economy. If, on the other hand, he has to deal with a highly educated congregation, they may hold very strong and very widely different opinions, and consequently might resent positive teaching unless the greatest tact is employed.

"In my own experience I have seen clergymen taking up very different attitudes in different parishes. I have known some who, by actively leading social movements, have done great good; others I have known who have adopted a distinctly neutral attitude. On the other hand, I have known clergymen who have done great injury by interfering actively to suppress popular movements. At the same time I do not at all believe in a great deal of the talk that we hear about the antipathy between the parsons and the people. Even Conservative friends of mine have told me that they are convinced that whenever the rural population get a chance to vote, they will vote against the squire and the parson. I don't believe that anything of the kind is true. I believe that the number of clergymen who have raised a definite spirit of antagonism on the part of their parishioners is much more limited than is generally supposed."

In reply to my question as to the exact manner in which, so far as his experience went, he had found the influence of the Church had been most successfully brought to bear upon labour problems, Sir John Gorst replied: "I consider that the Pope's Encyclical furnishes an admirable example of the way in which the Church generally should deal with social questions. It is excellent alike in its general character and in its influence. It was an honest endeavour to apply the principles of Christianity to every-day affairs, and to bring them to bear on all social problems."

"It seems to me, Sir John," I remarked, "that your attitude would rather be that the Church generally should teach positive truths, and trust to their influence in leading men to solve the problems of the day in harmony with Christian truths than that her teaching should be definitely directed against the various present-day abuses."

"Certainly," he replied. "Perhaps an

anecdote will illustrate exactly what I mean. My friend Bishop Patteson, of Melanesia, with whom I was very intimate, told me on one occasion that in going to the South Sea Islanders he never sought to attack their customs. He said to me, 'I don't even tell them that cannibalism or Taboo is wrong. I simply teach them great positive truths, and trust to the influence of these truths to lead them to abandon their old evil practices. I find that this plan answers better than any negative teaching could possibly do.' That experience of Bishop Patteson's illustrates exactly what I think should be the right attitude of the Church with respect to social questions."

"There will, however," I urged, "occur from time to time opportunities for the clergyman to place himself practically at the head of social movements; he may find it possible to make his church the centre of a labour organisation. This has happened, for instance, with the Rev. Peter Thompson, of the Wesleyan East London Mission, who is treasurer of a branch of the Dockers' Union, and allows the dockers to hold their weekly meeting in one of his mission halls. Do you consider that a clergyman is wise in thus actively identifying himself with a labour organisation in order to draw the men away from the public-house?"

"This," said Sir John Gorst, "is one of those personal questions on which I find it very difficult to give an answer without knowing the whole facts of the case. You might ask me an equally difficult question, whether Cardinal Manning was right or wrong in the part he took in the dockers' movement; but here again I would rather express no opinion. It is certainly a good thing to draw the men away from the public-house. I have even thought that it is so great an evil that working men should have no rooms of their own in which to hold meetings of the character you indicate, that rooms ought to be provided for such purposes by local authorities. But this is a different question altogether from the question as to whether a clergyman should lead the movement." On the question of the relations of organised to unorganised labour, of men and women as rival employees, and other problems involving a practical application of general principles, Sir John Gorst also expressed the opinion that the Church's duty was confined to enforcing principles and leaving the application to be made by those who listen to the Church's teaching. The only instance in which he recognised the right of the clergy definitely and absolutely to step beyond the bounds of such an enforcement of positive truth was in the case of manifest cruelty, oppression, and tyranny. In such cases he said that it was imperative that the religious teacher should lift up his voice against crimes, condemned alike by God and man. His whole attitude generally was distinctly in favour of non-intervention of the Church in the practical disputes between capital, and the confining of the Church's duties to the enforcement of great moral principles, leaving their particular application in any given case to be decided by the individuals concerned.

III.

THE WARDEN OF TOYNBEE HALL.

THE Mediæval Church dreamed of being a universal peace-maker, when the Pope would settle in his court questions between kings or nations. The churches of to-day are haunted by the same dream. Each little flock hopes to inherit the kingdom, and its ministers aspire to settle questions between labour and capital. Things in dreams are not as they seem, but dreams now as in old times have their interpretations, and are sometimes guides to truth. The churches may, perhaps, help to solve the labour problems, but not by putting up their ministers to hear evidence and to give judgment. Their part is rather to teach than to judge and to give than to take evidence.

The public is the only potentate who can fill the place at which the Pope grasped, and from its opinion there is no appeal. It is for the churches so to inspire the public that its judgment will be sound, and then to offer the evidence on which it may exercise that judgment.

The chief duty of the churches to the world is to set forward an ideal of life, to draw out admiration for noble, generous, and honest conduct, and to show the penalties which surely follow all forms of lying and selfishness. This duty has special applications according as different subjects arise for the judgment of the public.

The labour problems, the rate of wages, the length of the working day, the rights of trades unions, the treatment of the unskilled, the weak and the old, press for settlement. A man once came to Christ saying, "Command my brother that he divide the inheritance with me." If labour and capital come to the churches urging that they command a different division of profits, the answer of the churches must be the answer of Christ: "Who made me a judge or a divider over you ? Beware of covetousness.'' It is covetousness on both sides which hinders the solution of the labour problems, and the special duty of the churches at the present juncture is to convince both capitalists and labourers of the covetousness which, like the proverbial mote in the eye, prevents fair judgment of others. David could not believe that he was the man who had taken a poor neighbour's one ewe lamb, and there are thousands of upright capitalists who would not believe that they are spoilers, and thousands of well disposed labourers whom covetousness has so blinded that they say of every capitalist, as Satan said of Job, "Doth he serve God for nought ?"

A few years ago, the Dock directors took credit to themselves because their system afforded a chance job to men who had lost their characters ; they were content to let a hungry crowd fight morning after morning like wild beasts around the dock gates ; they were content, knowing that the few shillings earned each week could not support life ; they were blinded by covetousness. At present manufacturers think themselves justified in polluting the air which must be breathed by thousands of their fellow-citizens, in employing women under conditions destructive to health, and in giving wages quite inadequate for the support of old age. They say such things are necessary to secure the interest on capital, and they spend on hospitals, on "handfuls of coal and rice," and in poor rates as much money as would have enabled the people to provide necessaries for themselves. They say it is "wrong" to reduce the return on capital, and do not see it is wrong to degrade human beings. They regard "4 or 5 per cent" as something sacred, and they do not see that Trade Unionism may be also sacred, and they give as "charity" what they say it is impossible to give as rights. They are blinded by covetousness.

On the other side, workmen bring railing accusations against employers, and charge them with designed malice and cruelty, they justify violence in the protection of their interests, and they boast of the use they will make of their strength. They profess carelessness of "imperial" questions so long as "wages" questions are neglected, and they kill in themselves many generous instincts. "What," said a speaker at a debate, "was the empire to him ? he had nothing to lose except a few pawn-tickets." They put their own good before the common good, and set up standards of wages rather than standards of skill. They are jealous of excellence, and hinder the growth of the co-operative movement by their eagerness for dividends. They protest against sweating and themselves buy "sweated" clothes. The men who abuse their fellow-men, and who throw away a birthright with its far-reaching issues for the sake of an immediate rise in wages, are blinded by covetousness.

The workmen have doubtless excuses for their attitude. "Ask for all, take what you can get, and ask for more," is a sentiment applauded at public meetings by men who are conscious of unjust treatment and who think it no wrong to be unjust in their turn. The churches in dealing with them must be tender, but none the less strong. The covetousness of capital has in some measure spent itself, and is at any rate violently condemned ; the covetousness of labour is much more threatening, and friends of labour are sometimes too kind to be true. The churches approving themselves as friends by sympathy, by sacrifices, and by patience, must also be severe. "The nearer, the severer," is a proverb whose application is often forgotten.

There is perhaps a more subtle effect of covetousness which is also complicating the relations between rich and poor. It is said of the English that in the government of India they make "too much of interest and too little of passions." They think wounds to pride, blighted hopes, and religious disappointment may all be healed by higher wages, better drainage, and good order. Their own covetousness makes them exaggerate the covetousness of the Indians. In the same way the alienation of labour and capital, the dislike shown by the agricultural labourers for kindly squires and honest parsons, anger of employers against humane agitators, are due to the fact that each side, being covetous, has treated the other side as if it were covetous and nothing more. Labour and capital think too much of interest and not enough of passion in dealing with one another. Conscious of being human, of having wants and hopes, each resents being treated as if interests were supreme ; the labourer resents the attempt to buy him with a gift, while he is denied a voice in the parish council, and the employer knows the agitator does him wrong when he says that the only way of making him feel is through his pocket.

The public whose opinion has ultimately to settle the labour problems is made up of capitalists and labourers. To the public, therefore, the churches must repeat Christ's message. Their ministers must show the failure of covetousness, the havoc it works in character, the misery, the poverty it brings in its train. But, chiefly, they must hold up for admiration that human life which makes every one who is human turn from greed as from something foreign to his humanity. They will thus fit the public to decide between labour and capital. Their second duty is to present the facts on which judgment is to be formed. The Labour Commission is in one sense a reproach to the churches ; there ought to have been no need to discover by special enquiry how labour lives, is paid, and organises itself. The Churches of Christ exist that they may follow Christ, bring to light things which are hidden, and unite in one flock the many folds. If, when employers are charged with making a full life impossible for the labourers, they urge, "We never knew," and if, when labourers are charged with bringing lying accusations against the employers and making trade impossible, they urge, "We never knew," how are the churches to excuse themselves whose duty it was to unite rich and poor in holy communion ?

The churches have to reveal the poor and the rich to one another. At present they are unknown. The rich think the poor are so made as to enjoy their life of work ; they talk as if a wage of twenty shillings a week were quite satisfactory, and condemn the extravagance which "wastes" a few shillings on a picture or a few pounds on a funeral. They are astonished that workmen's girls should desire to be taught the piano, or that workmen themselves should aspire to travel ; they think the club doctor, paid at the rate of four shillings a year, with the gift of a hospital letter, ought to meet all the needs of ill-health. The rich do not conceive the life lived in the thousands of homes occupied by workmen, and they are not much helped by the sensational stories which have become the padding of advertising charities, and which are true only in a few exceptional cases.

But the poor are quite as ignorant of the lives of the rich, and they are not helped to understand them by the revelations of the law courts or the representations on the stage. The poor do not know the simple home-life of the average English employer, the talk about things and books by which the minds of old and young are cheered, the thoughts about others, about neighbours and workmen, about foreign affairs and trade complications which occupy quiet hours, the actions for others' pleasure which every day take up so much time. The breakfast table of an employer, with its family circle, would probably reveal to the workman a new way of living. A man was once asked how he thought a rich man spent his day. "In eating and in sleeping," was the answer, typical of the common opinion. Mr. Charles Booth is doing the work of the churches by showing the public how the poor live, but he would be the first to confess that his figure-picture is a lifeless picture. It is the churches which can show the poor man to the rich man, the rich man to the poor man, so that the one will understand the other. When they have met on the equal platform of the church's floor and looked into one another's eyes at the church's conference or meeting, when they have met at one another's houses and learned by what they see how the others live, the employer will not any longer doubt that the workman has a mind, or the workman doubt that the employer has a heart.

The churches by speech, in season and out of season, must teach the public how people live ; they must give facts and figures, examples and instances. And as knowledge comes by contact more than by hearsay, they must bring rich and poor together to enjoy the same pleasures, to discuss the same questions, to join in the same pursuits. They must in a very real sense make them neighbours before they can love others as they love themselves. "War comes," we are told, "by misunderstanding." This is true of the labour-war, and this misunderstanding the churches might do much to remove. Public opinion inspired by a high ideal and instructed in the facts of life would do most to settle the labour problems. It is indeed public opinion, and not force nor law, which largely fixes the rate of wages and the length of the working-day. English public opinion will not now allow workpeople to live as the Chinese live, or even to go barefoot. Public opinion might make it impossible for English work-people to live without leisure for reading or recreation, without resources for health or travel, without room for decency or cleanliness, as it might make it impossible for English employers to surround themselves with luxuries useless in the development of their own characters or in those of others.

The churches have done much, but they have not educated public opinion in this direction. They have rather been ambitious, sometimes for the triumph of the doctrine they represent, sometimes for their ministers. They have seemed to the people to be anxious only to make proselytes, or to get a reputation of being peacemakers or arbitrators. "Advertising parsons and peripatetic philanthropists" are the titles their ministers have earned. There are churches whose members are on the side of capital, and there are churches whose members are on the side of labour, and the teaching of the ministers gets a bias from the members. The churches do not afford a common meeting-place for rich and poor, nor a means of communion which would make one help the other. They are indeed often symbols of division rather than of unity, and the "West End" church, with its luxuries of warmth, colour, sound, and eloquent preaching, has little in common with the "East End" church. The very charities of which the churches boast are signs of their failure to create the charity which comes by knowledge. The rich give not as to brothers and sisters, but as to "masses" who can be satisfied with penny dinners, old clothes, and shelters.

The churches have not educated public opinion to beware of covetousness or to understand the facts of life. They have often rather themselves illustrated the force of covetousness. They have introduced class distinctions into places of worship, and have made charity a barrier and not a bond. They still, however, hold the field as educators, and with them it largely rests to solve the labour problems. They are still supreme in many departments of life, and each church can show a record of work which must command attention. They are still the outward expression of the small voice which speaks in every man, and they still bear in them the marks of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The churches (or as I would rather say the Church) are therefore powerful, and when they make their buildings meeting-houses of rich and poor, their highest service a communion, and their chief doctrine the preaching of Christ, they may so educate public opinion as to settle forever, on a stronger foundation than on a decision of an arbitrator, or even on a law, the rate of wages and the hours of labour.

SAML. A. BARNETT.

IV.

REV. HENRY T. SMART.

THERE are few things more to be desired than the reconciliation of Capital and Labour, and the re-union of the classes. The wedge of separation between employers and employed has been driven far enough, and must not be driven farther, lest if the breach be widened the nation should be ruined. Whoever can help to remove this wedge and to weld the classes together is bound to use his influence to promote so laudable an object. One of the first conditions, however, of anything approaching to success in such an endeavour is that the mind be disabused of the idea prevalent in some quarters, and perhaps lurking secretly in unsuspected places, that working-men are constitutionally dissatisfied, and ought to be classed with the four things that, according to the wise man, never say "Enough!" Bismarck is reported once to have said that Providence having denied to working-men the faculty of contentment, there was nothing to be done but to resolutely govern them. He who shares that opinion is not qualified for the office of peacemaker. No doubt there are extreme and unreasonable men amongst the industrial community, but I am not aware that it is the peculiarity of the working classes that such persons are included in their number. I am glad to be able to furnish some proof—indisputable as far as it goes—that the employed are as reasonable, as conciliatory, as judicious, as the employers.

If I allude to work in which I myself was engaged, it is because the general editor thinks that my experience may be useful, which perhaps it may, seeing that sometimes an ounce of fact is more serviceable than a ton of argument.

I have good reason to know that typical Trade Unionists and Labour Representatives are averse to strikes, except as a final resort; that they are in favour of boards of conciliation and arbitration, composed of equal numbers of employers and employed, for the adjustment of trade disputes, and that they are able, not only in meetings of their own order, but in business meetings composed of masters and workmen, to take a sensible, equitable, and practical view of the respective claims of Capital and Labour.

Shortly after the close of a disastrous strike in Manchester, I had occasion, acting in concert with the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, to convene a meeting of workmen to discuss the question of the possibility and desirability of establishing in that great industrial centre a tribunal for the amicable settlement of labour disputes. The first meeting of workmen, held on Wesleyan Methodist premises, was attended solely by members of Trade Unions and the Chairman and Secretary of the Manchester and Salford Trades Council, which represents perhaps ninety different trades.

The discussion was free enough, for no restraint was imposed except such as was necessary for the purpose of order, and workmen are accustomed to express themselves with tolerable frankness, yet little was said that was objectionable, and the proceedings, as a whole, reflected credit upon the working-class. Of course the proposal met at first with some disfavour. A workman who appeared to be a humourist, as indeed are many of his order, said he was in favour of "compulsory conciliation," and the sentiment evoked cries of assent, for this speaker was not the only man present whose temper was more than sufficiently bellicose. The proposal was regarded for some time with suspicion and shyness. It was thought by some that I was the puppet of the employers, and that the employers were in favour of conciliation at the moment because trade was good, and any interference with it then would be injurious to the interests of Capital. Evidence was given of the existence of that class-prejudice—not to say class-hatred—which is responsible for the breach that divides employers and employed, and which, to uninterested outsiders like myself, appears senseless and utterly unworthy of a nation that professes to believe in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. But, as an active and influential representative of Labour, who was associated with the movement and to whom I mentioned this circumstance, said to me in private, this distrust of employers and aversion to them, which characterise some workmen, is largely the result of *old*, real, or supposed grievances, and is, in truth, a survival of by-gone days, when the community had not absorbed as much of the teaching of Christ as it has now done.

Had the resolution, which we discussed at that first meeting of the employed, and which was in favour of the establishment of a Board of Conciliation, been put from the chair that night, there is good reason to believe that the vote would have been an adverse one, and that the project would have been nipped in the bud, and that, consequently, my experience would have made me less sanguine than I am concerning the prospects of social peace. But at the instance of the Secretary of the local Trades-Council, the conference was adjourned for a month, in order that the idea might simmer in the minds of the workmen, and their not unnatural distrust of the scheme might be removed. This action on the part of a Labour representative was eminently judicious and creditable alike to his heart and his head. Prudent men believe in making haste slowly, and in giving new ideas time to grow. My Labour friend is a prudent man, for this was his policy. During this interval the suggestion was discussed by the workmen in their Unions and elsewhere, and also in the Press, and the result was that when I had the pleasure of meeting the employed a second time, the meeting did not terminate until a vote had been taken in favour of the resolution, and that without a single dissentient. The impression left on my mind by those friendly talks of the men was that the employed are, as a class, opposed to strikes, as they may well be, and that they have as much confidence in the justness of employers as employers have in the justness of workmen. If that be so, it is desirable that it should be known, for we do not gather that this is the case from the articles on the subject which we read from day to day in the *Times* newspaper. And because I believe that the impression I have described was a correct one, I am pleased to publish it for the behoof of all who are interested in the great Labour movement.

But the question may be asked, Will workmen conduct themselves with propriety when they sit at the same table with employers, and are possessed of equal powers, and will their decisions in cases where they are called to adjudicate be equitable, and not given solely in the interest of their own class?

I am happy to believe that an affirmative answer may be given to this inquiry. My reason for that opinion is as follows: the reader will take it for what it is worth. It was my privilege to accompany the representatives of Labour to the office of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, where we met by appointment about an equal number of the representatives of Capital, and discussed the best means of giving effect to the resolution which the employed had passed and addressed to that influential body of business men. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce is second in importance to no Chamber in England. It is older than the London Chamber, it is in the heart of the greatest centre of industry in the country, and within its walls the historic "Manchester School" had its rise. Cobden was once an influential member of this Chamber, which now includes one or two Members of Parliament, and a large number of shrewd men of business, who know how to make money, and also how the making of money is prevented, as well as any men in England. At one of their own meetings the Chamber of Commerce had expressed an opinion in favour of the proposal now under consideration, and had deputed a few of their directors to meet the representatives of Labour, and to discuss a scheme with them, a report to be presented to the full Chamber for adoption or otherwise. It will thus appear that all hindrances to discussion were removed out of the way. After a preliminary meeting of the two parties it was decided to adjourn for a month in order that each side might draw up a practical scheme. It was arranged that this should first be done without concert, and that a week before the next meeting the employers should exchange copies of their draft with the employed, and thus each party should be made familiar with the views of the other before coming together again for discussion. It will be seen that this arrangement was calculated to test not only the business capability of the employed, but also their judiciousness and fitness for the office of arbitrator. It is conceivable that the employed might have prepared a ridiculously one-sided scheme, in which all the advantage should be given to Labour, and the rights of Capital should be set at naught. As a matter of fact the scheme of the employed was considered to be as equitable, and, on the whole, as practical as the scheme of the employers, and some of the workmen's suggestions were at once adopted by the directors, because they appeared to be just and wise. After much discussion both parties agreed to a plan. This document was in course of time sent by the directors to the Chamber of Commerce, and by the representatives of Labour to the Trades' Council. It was eventually accepted by both of these bodies, and a tribunal was established in Manchester, with the concurrence of capitalists and workmen, for the amicable adjustment of Labour disputes. Here my experience ends, but as I have sustained the proposition with which I set out, that need cause no regret. It does not fall within my purpose to discuss whether or not we shall end our Labour troubles by establishing everywhere Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration. All I intended at the outset to do was to show that the employed are not enamoured of strikes, and that they are competent to take their full share in all efforts that are calculated to secure the maintenance of friendly relations between masters and workmen.

As, however, this REVIEW exists to promote the reunion of Christendom, I may add that my experience, during the time to which I now refer, proved to me that the best way to further this end is not to argue about the insignificance of the questions that divide the Churches, but to endeavour to unite Christians of all denominations in common efforts to promote the practical amelioration of the conditions of life for our less favoured fellow-creatures.

A movement of this kind in Salford with which I was associated, having for its object the promotion of the wholesome housing of the people, brought again and again to Wesleyan-Methodist premises, the Bishop of Salford, the late Dean Oakley, the Rev. Bernard J. Snell, M.A., B.Sc., now of Brixton Independent Church, and the Rev. Canon Stowell, M.A. Nothing but an aggressive philanthropic enterprise would have caused men of such diverse views to meet on the same platform.

Work of that kind, however, was the means of bringing together these representatives of the Churches, and resulted in giving them mutual respect. In this direction, rather than in the direction of controversy, lies my hope for the reunion of the various sections of the "holy Church throughout all the world."

HENRY T. SMART.

V.

MR. BEN TILLETT.

MY friend, Dr. Lunn, having asked me to contribute an opinion to his Review upon the attitude of the Churches toward progressive Labourism, I would first of all like to point out the relation of the Churches to the workers. At the present moment, of the adult population not more than ten per cent. can be safely said to participate with any intelligent activity in religious movements. The lack of education has been necessarily the cause of this retrograde movement; and undeveloped appreciation of moral things is only the result of economic conditions which do not allow of mental growth, and a moral preparation for the higher duties of citizenship. At the present moment there is no real definite effort being made by any of the Churches, of whatever creed or profession, in the direction of solving the labour problem. Ministers and religious folk, widely absorbed in spiritual things, entirely overlook the necessity of improving the mental and material conditions as a necessary work to ensure higher spiritual things. The result is only in the direction of a charity which is doing more to sap the independence and hamper the resources of men and women, whilst it has been the paralysing force of any real progressive work, because men and women, profiting by charity, have, in the gratitude of their hearts, while accepting gifts, forgotten as well as the favour, the economic cause of their poverty, and have, while kissing the hand of the benefactor, been parties to one of the most vile and corrupting schemes—that of doling out charity. Very few have realised the economic position, very few have realised the real purport of our present industrial system, very few have realised the home life of the people, very few have realised the great want in the life of the workers, of culture, of refinement, and of higher desires, who now in rooms and slums accept work-a-day life amid environments which but tend to contract the lives and determine the most vicious traits and weaknesses, that only freedom from industrial pressure can ever alter.

At the present moment in our textile industries, employers, so-called religious men, benefit by a scheme and directly encourage women-labour and child-labour, so that for fifty years past men and women have endeavoured to get passed through the House of Commons some measure to protect women; well knowing the facts of the case that in our textile industries the mother is so absorbed, her strength, her every mental activity, made to serve her employer, that she gives to her children, her home, and her husband but a tired, weary womanhood which must inevitably result in the deterioration of our race. What are the facts of the case? Why that in the Black Country women work at forges making chains, become mothers one night,* and are again too soon at work. In our textile industries, women work within a few hours of becoming mothers, many of them are again at the mill before the week is over; not only are they at the mill but they have been up and at work two or three days before even that. All this is encouraged by religious employers, deacons of churches, by public men who are gaining notoriety for philanthropy and statesmanship—all this is directly encouraged by these men and, where they are legislators, they directly oppose the raising of the age limit of child-labour, use specious arguments, adopt the usual tactics of quoting averages, entirely ignoring the very serious allegations made against them on account of the employment of child-labour, and when cornered use the old characteristic cant that all these things are a necessity to trade.

Mr. Charles Booth points out that in London there is a million and a quarter of real poverty statistics from various parts of the country, showing that one-seventh of the entire population is submerged in conditions that can only mean impure lives, whose only fruit can be unchastity, criminality, viciousness, low cunning, and every one of the ills that poverty is the prolific mother of. With the exception of such efforts as are made by the Congregational body and the Salvation Army, in providing shelters for outcasts, there has not been, there is not even at the present moment, any direct effort being made to alter these conditions. Night after night one sees long rows of tired hungry men waiting their turn to be taken in for a few hours' rest. Where the equal number of women go to, God only knows; where the children of these men and the children of these women get to is another awful mystery. And in contemplating all these conditions the Church must realise its responsibility, knowing full well that its main source of support really comes from those whose position in life gives them their chance above other folk. Perusal of the evidence given before the Labour Commission, before the Sweating Commission, would be of incalculable value to those who do not realise the great depth of poverty in which the people are steeped; the poverty that narrows, degrades, and makes ugly the lives of all the people who are subject to these low conditions.

The great bulk of workmen have not been reached, neither have efforts been made, nor will they ever be made to do so, until the Church realises that the material, none too promising, is yet worthy of attention, and of making such effort that the men and women themselves shall be active promoters of their own welfare; being aided in their efforts by the intelligence and support of those whose education, position in life, and enlightenment may be of value in assisting towards the development of schemes for social betterment, which will mean the development of men and women of the best type. I would suggest a conference of the Churches in some great centre, of the creation of small committees in all industrial centres, which shall confer and take evidence and consult as to the best means by which religion can help the toilers provided the accredited representatives of workmen are consulted. The whole effort will be a healthy one, and will tend to stir up a keener interest in life, and will serve, above all things, to the awakening of conscience, love, principle, and duty in the hearts of those who think their duty is performed when they have chanted their praise to their Maker. I could give no stronger advice, could not with language however illustrated or lucid, explain more forcibly what is in my heart than the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah, which I would recommend all Christians to read, or any student of Biblical literature. To raise up the future generations is indeed a grand and noble work.

---

* One case is known of a woman giving birth to a child on the night previous to her being hard at work in the morning.

The great fault of all so-called reformers is either in creating some new-fangled scheme, or, with imbecility to be deplored, waiting for such to be recommended, before they see they can do anything, as if it were the duty of any distinct party or person to invent any scheme. There is one scheme that has been invented for 1900 years, but never tried. Let the Sermon from the Mount be put into operation, and your social reformer, your philanthropist, your statesman, your minister and your religious man, will have grappled the very essentials that can be looked upon to bring about an alteration in our industrial life. I would strongly recommend this conference between the Church and Labour. A little plain speaking from both sides would serve to filter and clear the air, and may, in some cases, sharpen antagonisms; but it will undoubtedly serve a great moral purpose, and will strengthen the hands of the righteous, as sincerity of motive and earnest desire to learn and to work prompt men upon any such conference. I quite agree with those who would be suspicious of any religious body taking too strong a lead in social reform, as in most cases where such bodies in history have taken such a lead the people's adherence, the people's love, the people's loyalty, have only been used for professional purposes. And the most lamentable feature of religious dominance is that of the great power of the priest in Ireland over the voters of Ireland, where the particular religious body is the real, active, dominating, directing force, and the will and mind of the people only subserve the purposes of self-appointed teachers. The relationship will be healthy when there is sturdiness on both sides. I would even go so far as to say that were the system of General Booth to be carried out in its entirety, and entirely absorbed under an autocratic government, the cure would be worse than the disease.

We can predict a healthy moral religious life along the material plane; and the moral plane of men's character would be higher and nobler if based upon the sure foundation of material prosperity. When religious hope believes in the religion of the body as well as the religion of the soul, God's purpose in creating man, in giving life to all living things, will be better understood and appreciated. As education advances, we shall not fear either the prelate or the priest; men will have a greater moral and mental balance, will come less under the domination and aid of religious bodies as they conscientiously develop their own inner religious life in its greater fulness and beauty.

In picturing the poverty of the country, I would suggest to my readers to imagine all the poverty of the country to be gathered together in a great city of five millions of men and women, weltering in slum life, a seething mass of humanity, without hope on earth, without hope of heaven; to imagine for a moment a city like London, without its banks, buildings, magnificent streets and houses, its wealth, its splendour, without all these things, but with a low straggling city of slum streets filled with ragged children, disheartened men, disheartened women, where disease and pestilence and suffering are bred, and childhood, youth, manhood, and womanhood all passed without a ray of divine light, without nobleness, without comfort. To imagine such a disconsolate city must move the heart of all thinkers, and yet in our little island such a great number of human beings are existing in this state. To imagine it in the aggregate, to imagine our beautiful London as a city of all this misery, then men may measure, men may understand, the extent of this great social fester, robbing heaven of men and women, robbing the earth of men and women, for no life can be developed in the fulness of its meaning while it breathes in such a putrid atmosphere, is narrowed in by bare walls, where hunger is faced every day, and empty cupboards, bare backs, and bare bones is the heritage of the submerged seventh. Even this does not picture, neither does it represent, the full extent of our national degradation. Even if the Church would now touch this seventh, there are many millions as yet not within the pale of Christian influence, of civilising influence, of humanising influence, whichever the taste of my readers may consider as the fittest term.

I would only say in conclusion that this country can but prosper by the efficiency and skill of its people, and that skill and efficiency can only be maintained by greater physical development, and physical development can only be obtained where sanitary conditions are found, and freedom from the cankering care of poverty, the dread of illness, and the dread of suffering is secured, and men and women are able to face life with hope in their heart, with health in their body, with God before them, looking to their future with a deep patriotism, and knowing they are linked in the great chain of generations—this is the best and strongest material that can be used to hold together a nation and the nations of the earth.

BEN TILLETT.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY PROFESSOR W. H. GREEN, D.D., LL.D., MODERATOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

From *The Independent* (Undenom.), New York, January 28, 1892.

As an evidence of the great interest taken in the theological controversy now before the Churches, the topics discussed last Sunday in some of the leading churches of this city may be quoted. In the Madison Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, Professor Miley, of Drew Theological Seminary, spoke on "The Agency of the Holy Spirit in the Authorship of the Scripture." Professor Vincent, of the Union Seminary, discussed "The Bible and New Testament Criticism" at the Church of the Puritans in Harlem. Dr. Behrends, of the Central Congregational Church, of Brooklyn, presented "The Bible and the Present Drift of Religious Thought" at the Church of the Covenant. A fourth sermon, on the same general subject, was delivered by Dr. Remensnyder, of St. James's Lutheran Church. Professor W. H. Green, of Princeton Seminary, analyzed "The Anti-Biblical Higher Criticism" in the Marble Collegiate Church (Dr. Burrell's) on Fifth Avenue.

Dr. Green is recognized as the leading conservative Bible critic of this country, and his position as Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly entitles him to a wide hearing. Taking for his text the statement of the Master that Moses wrote of him, he presented and criticised the methods of the Higher Critics of this country and Europe, which criticism, he said in conclusion, would be called not Biblical, but anti-Biblical. The following is the sermon in full:

> "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"—John v. 44, 47.

No graver crisis has ever confronted the evangelical Churches of Christendom, than that which they are called to face at present; none which affects matters so fundamental, or the issues of which are so serious and so far-reaching. Heretofore, the contests within the Church have concerned questions of doctrine or of policy, more or less momentous; but all parties recognized one supreme authority. The Word of God was the admitted standard by which all controversies were to be ultimately decided. But now the Word of God is itself brought into question, and the issue which is forced upon us is, Is the Bible what the Church has always believed it to be, and what we have always been taught to regard it? Or must the old view of the Bible be given up, and a new view be substituted for it, by which its authority and trustworthiness will be seriously impaired?

Attacks upon the genuineness and the truth of the books of the Bible, made by the enemies of the Bible, are no new thing. Nor is there anything novel in such attacks made in the name of Biblical Criticism by scholars, who have no faith in the supernatural. They cannot consistently do otherwise than discredit the books of Moses with the marvelous miracles which they record, and the accurately fulfilled prophecies which they contain. The only thing that is novel in the present situation is the acceptance of these critical conclusions by Christian scholars, who claim to be evangelical in their creed, and to be reverent students of the Word of God.

They admit the allegation that it has been demonstrated that several of the books of the Bible were not written by the persons to whom they have heretofore been attributed. But this, they affirm, need occasion no concern. It is really no damage to the Christian faith. Human authorship matters little in the books of Scripture. The only thing of consequence is divine authorship. Let the critics establish what they may, the heart of the matter is beyond their reach. The divine origin and authority of Scripture are not dependent upon their human authors, but upon God, whose Word it is.

Now we wish it distinctly understood at the outset that we do not object to the application of the most searching tests to the books of Scripture, and the most thorough scrutiny as to their real origin. Turn on the light from every possible quarter and ascertain the exact truth. If all antiquity has been in error and the Jewish people and the Christian Church through all the ages have been in error in believing that the Pentateuch was the production of Moses, let the truth be told though the heavens fall.

We think it capable of demonstration that Moses did write the Pentateuch and that the objections by which the attempt has been made to set aside the faith of all past ages and to contravene the explicit testimony of our Lord in this matter can be shown to be invalid. This, however, is not the point to which I ask your attention at this time. My object at present is to set before you the gravity of the question at issue. It is not so indifferent a matter as it has been represented to be, whether or no Moses wrote the Pentateuch. It is said that the contents of the first five books of the Bible remain the same, whoever wrote them and whenever they were written. It may still be the Word of God and equally command our faith, whether it was all written in the Mosaic age and by Moses himself, or was written by other inspired men in later ages.

But this reasoning leaves out of view the intimate connection between the genuineness of a production and its truth and authority. It is not accounted a matter of indifference in the affairs of ordinary life, whether a legal instrument, claiming to be authoritative, or commercial paper, purporting to represent a given value, has proceeded from the proper authority, and whether the signature that it bears is genuine. If it is not from the source that it claims to be, and the signature attached to it is false, it is not worth the paper that it is written on.

Moses was a commissioned messenger of the Most High. His inspiration is attested by indubitable proofs. Our Lord and the inspired writers of the New Testament abundantly confirm the claim of the Pentateuch to be regarded as the Word of God, but in so doing, they uniformly attach to it the name of Moses; Moses says, Moses wrote, Moses taught, the law of Moses, etc. It is as God's Word through Moses, that they commend it to our faith. If you detach these books from Moses as their author, you thereby detach them likewise from the indorsement of our Lord and his Apostles. They bid us accept what Moses taught and what Moses commanded. If these are not the teachings of Moses, and these commands are not his, their sanction is withdrawn.

Much has been said of late about the absolute inerrancy of the original autographs of Scripture, as though the question at issue at present was one of minute accuracy in trivial and unessential matters, and this related only to hypothetical originals no longer in existence, and was a mere inference from a particular theory of the mode of inspiration. This is an utter misunderstanding of the real gravity of the case. The actual issue which is now before the evangelical Churches of Christendom is far more serious and far-reaching than this. It is vital and fundamental. It is a question of the historical truth and the divine authority of the Old Testament from beginning to end. Are its statements trustworthy? Can they be depended upon, not in minor and unessential matters, but in the great body of its contents? and has it any just claim to be regarded as really the Word of God? Its historical truth and its divine authority are closely linked, and must stand or fall together, not only because that which is untrue is thereby evidenced not to be from God, but because the Old Testament is professedly a record of God's revelation to his chosen people through a long series of ages. If the facts as therein set forth are true and real, it is beyond question an immediate divine revelation. If the alleged facts are fictitious the revelation itself is unreal.

The particular point to which I wish to direct your attention this evening is the bearing of the critical hypotheses respecting the Pentateuch upon its historical truth, and consequently upon its divine origin and authority.

If, according to the common and well-attested belief upon this subject, Moses is the author of these books which bear his name, their historic truth is placed beyond controversy. If Moses is the author of the narrative of those fearful plagues which broke the obstinacy of Pharaoh, and of the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, and of the majestic scenes attending the delivery of the Law at Sinai, and of the journeyings of Israel through the wilderness attended by so many manifestations of divine grace and power; and if he placed on record the legislation attributed to him and which he is said to have received directly from God himself, then we have in this fact the highest possible voucher of the truth and certainty of the whole. It is the testimony of an eyewitness and a principal actor in the scenes recorded, of unimpeachable veracity; his record was made at a time when the events were fresh in the minds of the whole people; and his word is moreover confirmed by the mighty signs and wonders wrought by him, which are God's own attestation to its truth.

But we are told that we lose nothing by accepting the critical hypothesis, which denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and affirms it to be of composite origin; that this hypothesis is not discredited because unbelieving critics, such as

Kuenen and Wellhausen, have used it to destroy the authority of the Pentateuch. In the hands of evangelical critics it is harmless. What evil can result from admitting that the Pentateuch is a compilation from four different inspired documents? Then instead of only one witness we have four separate witnesses to the history of the Mosaic period. These have been compared to the four Gospels, which supplement and corroborate each other and give a more complete and better attested life of Christ than could have been afforded by one alone. And it has even been alleged that we have in the Pentateuch a singular advantage beyond that which we possess in the Gospels. Uninspired men have undertaken to harmonize the Gospels, and to combine them into one continuous narrative. But there is much in even the best of these efforts which is open to question. Of different possible arrangements of the materials we cannot be certain in every case that the right one has been reached; whereas the Pentateuchal history is already compacted for us into one continuous narrative by one inspired redactor.

Such is the representation that has been made. Now let us look at the actual operation of this critical hypothesis, and that not in the hands of Kuenen and Wellhausen, but of those who call themselves evangelical critics. We shall leave out of view the more destructive speculations and inferences of the former, and confine ourselves to those consequences which are inseparable from the hypothesis, however inclined its advocates may be to present it in the most favorable aspect possible.

The authors of the four Pentateuchal documents, which the critics profess to have discovered, are altogether unknown. The age in which they lived is uncertain and can only be approximately ascertained. For convenience in referring to them they are commonly designated by the letters of the alphabet, J, E, D, and P. J, the Jehovist, speaks of God uniformly as Jehovah, E prefers instead to call him Elohim, the Hebrew for God. D is the writer of Deuteronomy. P is the priestly writer to whom we owe the great body of the ceremonial law, as well as certain portions of the Pentateuchal history which are supposed to be linked with it. J and E are conceived to have been the oldest of these documents. The Rev. Dr. Driver, of Oxford, England, whose "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" has recently been published under the editorial supervision of Dr. Briggs, of New York City, and Dr. Salmond, of Aberdeen, Scotland, tells us that J and E were not later than 750 B.C., and they may belong to the early centuries of the Monarchy. If we understand him to mean by this vague expression the earliest date to which it can possibly apply, they may perhaps be coeval with the age of David and Solomon. At the very least, therefore, they are at a remove of 400 years from the time of the Exodus, a distance of time equal to that which separates us from the discovery of this continent by Columbus, or from the birth of Martin Luther. Or if the larger limit be allowed, they may be more than 300 years later still. Dr. Driver assigns D to the reign of the ungodly king Manasseh, eight centuries after the Exodus, and P after the Babylonish Exile, nearly or quite ten centuries from the Exodus. For our knowledge, consequently, of the whole Mosaic period we are dependent upon records, which are from 400 to 1000 years subsequent to the events which they relate, and which are based upon the popular traditions of the time when they were prepared. And let it be remembered that the age of Moses was the foundation period of the Old Testament religion when its institutions were ordained by God himself amid signal attestations of the divinity of their origin; a period, therefore, respecting which it is of the utmost consequence that we should possess positive certainty of the truth and reality of the events recorded.

What credit would be attached to the Gospels, if, instead of being written by contemporaries and eyewitnesses, or based upon the testimony of those who were, they were composed four centuries, eight centuries and ten centuries after the time of Christ, and reported simply the stories that were circulating respecting him at these several dates? And, further, if instead of being written by well-known apostles and evangelists, their authors were entirely unknown and their origin purely conjectural? What foundation would we have for our belief in anything that is related of Jesus Christ or in the truth and reality of his miracles and his death for our redemption, if all rested upon such a basis as this?

But it is said that other histories of the Old Testament are compilations and are anonymous, and were written long after the events which they record. Thus the Books of Kings contain the history of 450 years from Solomon to the Exile, and could not, of course, have been written until after the latest event which they record. But it is to be observed that the contents of these books are throughout drawn from public and contemporary records, to which appeal is made at the close of every reign; and thus an adequate guarantee is given of the accuracy of the history. It is also the case that Moses records the lives of the Patriarchs, though he was born 500 years after the call of Abraham. But here again it is to be observed that the inspiration of Moses, of which we have the most abundant proofs in the notable miracles wrought through his instrumentality, is God's own attestation of the truth of all that he has delivered to us in the Book of Genesis, not only respecting Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but of the earliest ages extending back to the creation of the world.

Here, however, we are met by the question, If the inspiration of Moses accredits the narratives of Genesis respecting events long prior to his time and even the primeval ages, why may not the inspiration of J, E, D and P, in like manner, accredit the contents of the Pentateuch?

The reason is obvious: In the first place, we have abundant and decisive evidence of the inspiration of Moses; of J, E, D and P we know nothing whatever, and of their inspiration we have no proof. In the second place, the hypothesis of the critics in relation to these assumed documents is absolutely inconsistent with the idea of their inspiration in any such sense as affords any guarantee whatever of their historical truth. That this is so will appear from a statement of the grounds upon which the critics base their hypothesis for the partition of the Pentateuch. There are two principal criteria by which they undertake to distinguish the several documents, and which they regard as affording the clearest evidence of their existence. We must devote a few moments to the examination of these criteria, and shall then indicate the bearing which they have upon the historical truth of these documents and upon their inspiration in any proper sense of that term.

The first of these criteria is an alleged diversity of style and diction. Certain words and forms of speech are, it is said, peculiar to P in distinction from J and E, and wherever these characteristic expressions occur, this is an indication that the paragraph, sentence or clause, in which they are found, has been extracted from the document P. It is apparent how easy it is to make a division on this basis which is altogether factitious. The critic assumes that certain words and phrases are characteristic of one document, and certain other words and phrases are characteristic of another document. He accordingly goes through the Pentateuch with this criterion in view. Every paragraph, sentence and clause, in which any of the one class of expressions chance to be found, is regularly assigned to the one document; and with like regularity every paragraph, sentence and clause, in which any of the other class of expressions appear, is assigned to the other document. And when the partition is completed it is found that all of the one set of expressions is in one document and all of the other set in the other document. But the reason of this is, because the critic has put them there. The partition corresponds with the hypothesis, for the simple reason that it was made by the hypothesis.

There is another significant fact connected with this matter. The critics tell us that while P is readily distinguishable in style and diction from J and E, it is not possible to establish any clear distinction of this sort between J and E themselves. And the reason of this is obvious to one who examines the subject with any care. To P are assigned the ceremonial law, genealogies, statistics and such grand, world-wide events as the creation and the main portion of the flood, but almost nothing that pertains to the ordinary current of events and the experience of individual lives. What can properly be called the narrative portion of the Pentateuch is almost entirely divided between J and E. The natural and necessary consequence of this partition is that each document has those words and phrases which are appropriate to the subject matter assigned to it. P has not the words of ordinary narrative for the simple reason that such narrative is regularly given not to P but to J and E. And for the same reason P has not the style which belongs to narrative. It is said that there is a marked difference between these documents in point of style; that the style of P is rigid, formal, stereotyped and repetitious, and that of J and E is easy, flowing and picturesque. The difference is just that between genealogies, statistics and ritual legislation on the one hand and historical narrative on the other. The differences of style are obvious enough; but they indicate not a diversity of writer, but diversity of theme. And unless it be maintained that one and the same writer must always limit himself to the same class of subjects, with what propriety can it be insisted upon that he must invariably adhere to one uniform style? Why may not a historian, while he deals principally in narrative, insert likewise genealogies and ritual laws in their proper place? And if the genealogy has not the easy, flowing style of the narrative, is that any proof that it is from a different hand?

The impossibility acknowledged by the critics themselves of discriminating between the diction and style of J and E arises from the fact that the narrative parts of the Pentateuch are partitioned between them. Where there is diversity of matter, there is diversity of style. Where the matter is of the same description so is the style. There is nothing surely in all this to indicate that the Pentateuch is a composite production, made up by the blending of different documents. And thus we dispose of the first criterion proposed by the critics, on the basis of which they undertake to parcel the Pentateuch among the documents which they imagine that they have discovered. We are obliged, of course, to deal with this matter here only in the most general fashion. It is impossible now to go into details.

The second criterion upon which the critics base their partition of the Pentateuch is the one with which we are most particularly concerned at present, since it rests upon the assumption of the untrustworthiness of these alleged documents, and is fundamentally inconsistent with their inspiration, provided the term "inspiration" be used in its proper and universally accepted sense, as such a divine control over the writers of Scripture as secured their infallibility and guarded them from error. Here is where the allegation has its root, that Biblical Criticism requires a modification of the common doctrine of inspiration, as this is claimed by the sacred penmen, and has been the uniform belief of the Christian Church. This doctrine is opposed to one of the primary assumptions of that school of criticism which rends the Pentateuch into tatters. I say "assumptions" advisedly. It is not a conclusion established by this divisive criticism; but is assumed as the basis on which the divisive criticism is itself built. I refer to their assumption of the existence of duplicate and discrepant statements as a pervading feature of the Pentateuch narratives. This is, in fact, the main reliance of the critics. They affect to find duplicate and discrepant statements everywhere, and they point to them as clearly evidencing duplicate authorship.

The way in which these are made out, is simple enough. Two distinct events have certain features in common. These are compared, and are held to prove these events are not two but in reality are one and the same, and this in defiance of the explicit statements of the record. The critic unhesitatingly sets the direct and unequivocal testimony of the sacred historian aside, and assumes on the ground of a superficial resemblance in a few particulars that what is represented to be two separate occurrences is in fact but a single transaction. This assertion is made by the critic from no independent testimony tending to identify the two events or to show that the historian was in error. It is his own arbitrary judgment that the historian is not to be credited. Having thus converted the two events into one on the ground of a certain measure of correspondence, as though history never repeated itself the critic next displays their points of difference, not to show what they really do evidence that the events are in fact distinct as they appear on the face of the record, but that these are two variant accounts of the same thing. And as the same writer could not have given such diverse representations of the matter, it is argued that they must be attributed to distinct writers.

Thus for example Abraham, on two separate occasions, through fear for his own safety, prevaricated respecting Sarah, saying that she is not his wife but his sister. She is brought into peril in consequence, but is providentially released. The critics tell us that these must be regarded as variant accounts of the same transaction, which according to J occurred in Egypt at the court of Pharaoh, but according to E took place in Gerar at the palace of Abimelech.

Again Abraham made a covenant with Abimelech in relation to wells of water, which were an occasion of strife between their respective servants, and he called the name of the well where their bargain was made Beersheba, the well of the oath. At a later time Isaac was in the same region and had a like difficulty about wells. The name of the Philistine king was again Abimelech, which was the permanent appellation of the monarch, like Pharaoh in Egypt or Cæsar at Rome. Isaac had to dig over again the wells of his father which the Philistines had meanwhile stopped. So it came to pass that he too made a covenant with Abimelech respecting wells at Beersheba, thus furnishing a fresh reason for the name which it bore ever afterward. Here again the critics can see nothing but variant accounts of the same transaction, which one document connected with Abraham and another with Isaac.

The critics still further multiply what they consider variant traditions of the same occurrence by setting one part of a transaction over against the other part of it, as though they were conflicting statements. Thus two reasons are given in the sacred record why Jacob left his father's house to go to Padan-Aram. One was to escape the fury of Esau, whom he had overreached by fraudulently obtaining his father's blessing; the other that his father charged him to go and obtain a wife from among his kindred. The two are entirely consistent; but the critics create a discrepancy by saying that J and E give a reason of which P knows nothing but assigns as the reason something altogether different.

Again, they tell us that J and E have quite different versions of what happened to Jacob at Bethel. According to E, he had a dream, in which he saw a ladder reaching from earth to Heaven, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon it, but heard no voice and received no verbal promise. J, on the other hand, knows nothing of any dream or ladder or angels, but says that Jehovah there appeared to Jacob while he slept and made certain promises to him.

Thus by identifying distinct transactions or distinct parts of the same transaction, they find material for what they consider separate documents, each of which tells a story diverse from the others and at variance with them. The necessary effect of such treatment is, of course, to produce the appearance of discrepancies and divergencies everywhere. And the entire history from first to last is converted from a consistent, continuous and reliable record into a medley of contradictory and jarring stories, such as were floating about at the time when these several documents were written. It is obvious what becomes of the historical character of a record so dealt with. And need it create surprise that critics who have formed this conception of the Pentateuch clamor for a modification of the common doctrine of inspiration?

And it is not merely the patriarchal history, which is thus resolved into a mass of discordant materials. The Mosaic period fares in the same way. The same methods are applied to it and with a like result; and this not in its subordinate details but in matters of the greatest consequence. God reveals himself to Moses in Exodus, chapter iii, and again in chapter vi. Both times he announces his purpose to deliver Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and bring them to Canaan by the instrumentality of Moses. Stress is laid upon his name Jehovah as pledging this result, and upon Moses shrinking from the task, his brother Aaron is associated with him as a spokesman, and the miraculous sign is given of the rod changed into a serpent.

Here, again, the critics tell us, these are but different narratives of the same thing, and there are numerous contradictions between them. The locality is different and the whole situation is different. E locates it in the wilderness of Horeb, while Moses was keeping the flocks of his father-in-law in Midian; the Lord there appeared to him in the flame of fire in the bush. P knows nothing of Moses ever having been in Midian, or having seen the marvelous spectacle of a bush burning with fire yet unconsumed; he reports the revelation as having occurred in Egypt. According to E the people believed Moses, when he brought them this message; but, according to P, they refused to hearken to him. In E Aaron was to speak for Moses to the people; in P he was appointed to speak for him to the king. In E the signs were done before the people; in P they were done before the king. In E a rod possessing miraculous virtue was given to Moses as the instrument by which his wonders were to be wrought, in J the rod was not the effective agent but the material of the miracle; it was itself converted into a serpent. Thus the different documents vary materially in their representation of the affair. And it is inferred that they must have followed diverse traditions of it. What the exact truth in the matter was, and how much of what is recorded really took place, and how much is to be placed to the account of legendary accretions, which had gathered in the lapse of from four to ten centuries intervening before the record was made, is left to be inferred.

In like manner there are discrepancies between the different documents as to the plagues sent upon Egypt to compel Pharaoh to let Israel go. These concern the number of the plagues, what the plagues were, the design with which they were sent, and the manner in which they were wrought. According to P the plagues were simply exhibitions of power with which the magicians of Egypt vie with partial success at first, but are finally discomfited. J and E make no mention of any magicians. In P Aaron with his rod works the miracles; in E it is Moses with his rod; in J no rod was used at all. There is only one plague that the three narrators, P, J and E, have in common. From all this it has been inferred that the several traditions represented by these documents agreed that certain traditionary events preceded and facilitated the

Exodus: but there was no agreement as to what these events were.

The same sort of discrepancy is alleged of the passage of the Red Sea, the transactions at Sinai and the wanderings in the wilderness.

According to the critical hypothesis, even in the most moderate hands, the situation then is this: The Pentateuch, instead of being one continuous and self-consistent history from the pen of Moses, is made up of four distinct documents which have been woven together, but which the critics claim that they are able to separate and restore as far as the surviving remnants of each permit, to their original condition. These severally represent the traditions of the Mosaic age as they existed four, eight and ten centuries after the Exodus. When these are compared they are found to be in perpetual conflict. Events wear an entirely different complexion in one from that which they have in another; the characters of those who appear in them, the motives by which they are actuated, and the whole impression of the period in which they live is entirely different.

It is very evident from all this why the critics tell us that the doctrine of inspiration must be modified. If these Pentateuchal documents, as they describe them, were inspired, it must have been in a very peculiar sense. It is not a question of inerrancy, but of wholesale mutual contradiction which quite destroys their credit as truthful histories. And these contradictions, be it observed, are not in the Pentateuch itself, but result from the mangling and the mal-interpretations to which it has been subjected by the critics.

On the critical hypothesis the real facts of the history are not what they seem to be to the ordinary reader. They can only be elicited by an elaborate critical process. The several documents must first be disentangled and carefully compared; the points in which they agree and those in which they differ must be noted. And from this conflicting mass of testimony the critic must ascertain as best he may how much can be relied upon as true, how much has a certain measure of probability, and how much must be rejected altogether.

Another element of precariousness enters into the critical attempts to distinguish what is reliable from what is not in the Pentateuchal narratives. By the confession of the critics themselves and by the necessity of their hypothesis, the documents which they fancy that they have discovered are by no means complete. By singling out the paragraphs and clauses which are regarded as belonging to each of the documents severally, and putting them together, they undertake the reconstruction of the original documents, which are supposed in the first instance to have circulated separately as distinct and independent publications, but to have been subsequently fused together into the Pentateuch as we now possess it by a series of compilers or, as they are technically called, redactors. First, the two oldest documents, J and E, were combined by a redactor, and the combination was effected, it is supposed, by the following method: Sections or paragraphs, longer or shorter, were taken alternately from J and E and pieced together so as to form one continuous narrative. It was the purpose of the redactor to make the best use that he possibly could of these two sources at his command in preparing a history of the period of which they treat. In some cases he made full extracts from both its sources of all that they contained and preserved the language of each unaltered, making no additions or modifications of his own. Frequently, however, it was necessary to adjust what was thus taken from different works in order to make it read smoothly or to render it harmonious. Hence upon occasion he introduced explanatory remarks, or made such changes as seemed to be required in what he borrowed from J or from E. Sometimes his sources were so nearly parallel that it would lead to needless repetition to repeat them both. In such cases, accordingly, he confines himself to the account given in one of the documents, either omitting the corresponding statements of the other altogether, or weaving in a clause or a sentence here and there when it seemed to him distinctive and important. Again, cases occur in which the narratives of J and E were in real or apparent conflict. Here he does the best that he can. He either undertakes to harmonize their accounts, where this is possible, by inserting some statement which seems to reconcile them, by so changing the order of the narrative as to relieve the difficulty, or by converting inconsistent accounts of the same event into two different transactions. Where none of these methods is practicable and reconciliation is out of the question, the redactor adheres to one of his sources and disregards the other.

D, which was composed some centuries after this union of J and E, existed for some time as an independent work, and was then combined with J E by a new redactor, who besides attaching D to this previously existing work, retouched J E in several places and introduced a number of passage from his own point of view, which was different from that of the older historians.

Finally the document P was prepared, at first as a separate publication, but at length it was interwoven by a third redactor, with the pre-existing triplicate treatise D J E, the process being substantially the same as has already been described in the case of J E.

This is in general the method by which the critics suppose that the Pentateuch was gradually brought to its present form. It will be seen at a glance how the complexity of the critical problem is increased by the successive editorial labors which are supposed to have been brought into requisition in the course of the construction of the Pentateuch. The several documents must not only be distinguished from each other, but also from the various redactional additions and insertions which have at any time been made.

Let us assume that this delicate and difficult analysis has been effected with unfailing accuracy notwithstanding the liabilities to error vitiating the result, which increase at every step. But waiving this, what is the situation when the analysis has been accomplished? and what is its bearing upon the historical character of the Pentateuch?

The critics have undertaken to reproduce for us the documents J E D and P, which are our primary sources for both the Mosaic and the patriarchal history, and which date respectively four, eight and ten centuries after the Exodus. These documents are not only at variance with each other in their statements respecting numerous particulars, thus invalidating each other's testimony and showing that the traditions which they have severally followed are mutually inconsistent; but they are besides very incomplete. Numerous gaps and omissions occur in each. Matter which they once contained, as is evident from allusions still found in them, is now missing; how much it is impossible to tell.

But what is more serious, the parts that yet remain have been manipulated by the various redactors. The order of events has been disturbed; events really distinct have been fused together and mistaken for one and the same; and narratives of the same event have been mistaken for events altogether distinct; statements which are misleading have been inserted with the view of harmonizing what cannot in fact be reconciled; when traditions vary instead of being recorded in their integrity to afford some opportunity of ascertaining the truth by comparison, they have either been mingled together, thus disturbing both, or one only has been preserved, thus leaving no check upon its inaccuracies. All this and more, the critics tell us, the several redactors have done with their materials. No charge is made of dishonest intentions. But surely it is most unfortunate for the historical value of their work. There is no way of ascertaining how far these materials have been warped from their proper original intent by the well-meant but mistaken efforts of the redactors to correct or to harmonize them. That their meaning has been seriously altered in repeated instances, which are pointed out by the critics, created a very natural presumption that like changes have been freely made elsewhere which can now no longer be detected.

It is difficult to understand in what sense the redactors, whose work has been described, can be said to have been inspired. They certainly had no inspiration which preserved them from error, or even from making the gravest historical mistakes. They had no such inspiration, as gives any divine attestation to their work. The Pentateuchal history gathers no confirmation from having passed through their hands.

Upon the theory of the most conservative critics, for it is this with which we have been dealing, what dependence can be placed upon the historical statements of the Pentateuch? These are, as they allege, inaccurate and inconsistent with themselves not in the patriarchal period merely, but throughout the lifetime of Moses, when the foundation was laid of the Old Testament religion and those signal miracles were wrought which gave it undeniable divine sanction. The real facts are not those which appear upon the surface. They can only be elicited by an elaborate critical process which shall detect and remove the additions and attempted emendations of each of the redactors, and shall then restore the four documents to its pristine condition, so far as what remains of each will allow. This will put the critic in possession of a mutilated record of four variant traditions of the Mosaic age, as these existed four, eight and ten centuries after that date. And now it is by the help of such materials in the way of comparison, correction and elimination that he must sift out and ascertain the real facts. Must we not say that the history of the Mosaic age, if this be the only way of arriving at it, rests upon a quicksand? and that nothing of any consequence can be certainly known regarding it?

We have been able in the discussion of

this evening to look in a hurried way at but one feature of the disintegrating work which is done in the name of Biblical Criticism. I do not speak of the destructive inferences drawn by critics who are avowedly antagonistic to supernatural religion. I have confined myself to the conclusions accepted by that class of critics who claim to be evangelical, and who occupy positions of honor and influence in evangelical Churches, such as the British scholars and divines, Drs. Driver and Cheyne, and the American scholars who affiliate with them. We have looked at but one phase of their work, even as respects the Pentateuch. Had we been able to consider their treatment of the Mosaic laws, our conclusion would have been yet more abundantly confirmed. Here is no question merely of the strict inerrancy of Scripture—of absolute accuracy in unimportant minutiæ of precision in matters of science. This is not the issue raised by the theorizing of that class of biblical critics with which we contend. And it is no mere question of the mode of inspiration. It is the question whether any dependence can be placed upon the historical truths of the Bible; whether our confidence in the facts recorded in the Pentateuch rests upon any really trustworthy basis; facts, be it observed, not of mere scientific or antiquarian interest, but which mark the course of God's revelations to the patriarchs. It is the certainty of facts which are vital to the religion of the Old Testament, and the denials of whose truth weakens the foundations on which the New Testament itself is built. The critical theory which we have been examining, is destructive of all rational certainty of the reality of these truths; and thus tends to overturn the historical basis of the religion of the Bible. Our holy religion is an historical religion, based on a series of redemptive facts, in which God revealed himself to men and unfolded his will and gracious purposes. And to weaken the evidence of those facts, to cast doubt upon the reality of the historical occurrence, is to cast doubt upon the reality of that revelation which they embodied.

Those who hold these critical views which we have been considering may tell us that they believe in the truth of the Pentateuch, that they believe it to be inspired of God, that they believe it to be infallible in all matters of faith and duty. Of course, we do not question these statements of their personal faith. But this does not prove their critical theories to be harmless. It is well sometimes that men are inconsistent; that they who have adopted wrong principles or dangerous theories, do not always follow them to their legitimate conclusions. What we are concerned to know is not the personal faith of those who still cling to the creed in which they have been brought up in spite of their acceptance of a critical hypothesis which is antagonistic to it. What we are concerned to know is the legitimate tendency of the critical hypothesis itself. However some of its adherents may retain their faith in the historical truth of the Pentateuch and its divine inspiration and authority, this hypothesis, as has been shown, undermines them all. Its acceptance by those not so well grounded in these doctrines must tend to unsettle their faith. Its general acceptance must lead ultimately to the denial of its inspiration even in that qualified sense in which these critics profess to accept it now, as well as to the denial of its historical truth, as surely as the tree will bear fruit after its own kind.

It may be remembered that in the revision of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, which is now in progress, the proposition was made by the Committee appointed for that purpose to insert among the characteristics of Holy Scripture "The truthfulness of the history." And it may be remembered that this natural and appropriate emendation met with determined opposition in certain quarters. The animus and the motive of that opposition will sufficiently appear from the review of the attitude which this divisive criticism assumes toward the historical truth of the Bible. It is not Biblical Criticism properly so-called which antagonizes its truth, but what ought rather to be denominated "Anti-Biblical Criticism," since even in temperate hands and those which are most anxious to claim for themselves evangelical standing, it unsettles the verity of the sacred oracles and annuls the reality of their inspiration.

But a single word more. What must be the state of mind engendered toward the Scriptures by such speculation?

CHURCH FOLK-LORE.

BY J. EDWARD VAUX.

From *The Newbery House Magazine* (London), February 1892.

The Church Fabric.

When we search into the religious records of the past, we cannot, at times, help being painfully struck at what appears to us to have been the profanation to which our churches were subjected. No doubt the Puritans had much of this to answer for; but unquestionably a great deal of it was handed down to us from our pre-Reformation ancestors. So long as the chancels and chapels were not profaned, much licence was permitted as regarded the use to which the naves of our cathedrals and churches were put. They were employed for a great variety of secular purposes. Everybody has some sort of idea about S. Paul's Walk as a fashionable promenade, though they may have but little notion as to what took place there. As a matter of fact, it was the favourite place where gallants met their mistresses, and where fashionable loungers idled away their time in discussing the newest scandal. Hence was derived the well-known phrase of "dining with Duke Humphrey," signifying, of course, having no dinner at all. The duke was renowned for his hospitality, and the phrase came about thus: Though the duke was buried at S. Alban's, it was reported that a monument would be erected to him in S. Paul's. When the more fortunate promenaders left for dinner, those who had no dinner to go to said they would stay and look for the good duke's tomb. The fashionable hour for these promenades was as well defined as that now observed by West-end folk in London, when preparing for the afternoon drive, or for the canter in Rotten Row. The nave of S. Paul's was the generally recognised resort where those in "Society" met to see and to be seen. The naves of churches in pre-Reformation times were places where tradesmen assembled for bargain and barter; where lawyers had interviews with their clients; where owners of property deposited their goods, and where divers courts of justice were held. Abuses were continued, but before the eighteenth century began, "Paul's Walk" was, as regards its most offensive features, a thing of the past. Yet a good deal more than mere tradition of it remained. In a pamphlet published in 1703, "Jest" asks "Earnest" whether he has been at S. Paul's and seen the flux of people there. "And what could I do there," says the latter, "where men go out of curiosity and interest, and not for the sake of religion? Your shopkeepers assemble there as at full ''Change,' and the buyers and sellers are far from being cast out of the Temple." At Durham there was a regular thoroughfare across the nave until 1750, and similarly at Norwich until 1748, when Bishop Gooch stopped it. I believe that I am right in saying that the representatives of the Vavasour family have a traditional right to ride on horseback into the nave of York Minster, on the ground that one of their ancestors granted freedom of carriage through his land for stone used in the building of the cathedral. What actual authority there is for the correctness of this I am unable to say. The naves of York Minster and Durham Cathedral were fashionable promenades. The Confessor's Chapel at the Abbey made on occasion a convenient playground for the Westminster scholars, who were allowed, as late as 1829, to keep the scenes for their annual play in the triforium of the north transept. It is worth while, in passing, to state that one of the charges made by the Puritans against Laud was, that he forbade the justices of the peace to hold their court in the churchyard at Tewkesbury, because it was consecrated ground.

Those in authority, however, were fully alive to the heinousness of these scandals, and wished to put a stop to them. But even Henry VIII., with all his persistent energy, could not check the prevailing licence. His injunction that no person should abuse the churches—either by eating, drinking, buying, selling, playing, dancing, or with other profane worldly matters—seems to have been practically still-born. The edict had especial reference to "Church Ales," and the like. These parochial gatherings and merry-makings continued for many years after this king's reign, and throw no little light upon the customs of our forefathers. A description of them will therefore be interesting.

The "Church Ale," or "Whitsun Ale," as it was sometimes called, from the festival during which it was usually held, was quite an institution in olden time, and seems to have been carried on in a very systematic if not in a very seemly manner. Two wardens were generally chosen to superintend the preparations, and sometimes there was a lord and a lady. Thus in the churchwarden's accounts at Brentford, in 1676, appears an item: "Paid to her that was lady at Whitsontide, by consent, 5 shillings." At such times collections of money were made for church purposes. Stubbes, in his "Anatomie of Abuses," 1585, gives the following description of "The Maner of Church Ales in England":

> "In certain townes where dronken Bacchus beares swaie, against Christmas, Easter, Whitsontide, or some other tyme, the Churchwardens of every parishe, with the consent of the whole parishe, provide halfe a score or twenty quarters of mault, whereof some they buy of the Churche stocke, and some is given them of the parishioners themselves,

every one conferring somewhat according to his abilitie, which mault being made into very strong ale or beere, is set to sale, either in the Church, or some other place assigned to that purpose. Then when this is set abroche, well is he who can gette the soonest to it, and spend the most at it. In this kind of practice they continue sixe weekes, a quarter of a yeare, yea halfe a yeare together. That money, they say, is to repair their Churches and Chappels with; to buy bookes for service; cuppes for the celebration of the Sacrament, surplesses for Sir John, and such like necessaries. And they maintaine other extraordinarie charges in their parishe besides."

In connection with the above we find from Kethe's sermon at Blandford, 1570, that it was the custom at that time for the Church Ales to be kept on the "Sabbath Day," which holy day, says our author, "the multitude call their revelying day, which day is spent in bulbaitings, bearebaitings, bowlings, dicyng, cardying, daunsynges, drunkennes, and whoredom, inasmuch as men could not keepe their servantes from lyinge out of theyr own houses the same Sabbath day at night."

It may be useful here to add a word or two about the introduction of this term "Sabbath" to signify "Sunday." The elder Disraeli was probably not far wrong when he fixed upon 1554 as the year when the word came to be first used in England. A recent author notes that up to the present time the proceedings in the House of Lords on a Saturday are headed in the Journal as "Dies Sabbati." An amusing incident is recorded as having happened in Parliament when a discussion took place as to the King's Declaration respecting the "Book of Sports." In 1620 (February 15) a Bill was introduced for the "Keeping of the Sabbath, otherwise called Sunday." During the debate a certain Mr. Shepherd asserted that the Bill had been wrongly named, "for that everybody knew that the Sabbath was Saturday; wherefore it should have been entitled 'An Act for the observing of Saturday—otherwise called Sunday.'"

There were minor festivities similar in character to that mentioned above. Thus, while the Church Ales supplied the funds now provided by Church rates and Poor rates, the "Clerk Ales" furnished salaries for the minor officers of the Church. In a letter from Bishop Pierce to James I. there is this clause: "People sent him (the clerk) provision and came on Sundays to feast with him, by which he sold more ale. And since these have been put down, many ministers have complained to me that they are afraid they shall have no parish clerks."

It would be easy to enlarge upon institutions similar to the above, such as "Bid Ales" and "Bride Ales," but I must pass on.

Before doing so, however, I would remind readers that a little thought is necessary lest they over-estimate the impropriety of putting the naves of churches to secular or semi-secular uses in days gone by. It must be borne in mind that there were then very rarely spacious public rooms in which people could assemble, and that the nave of the church was practically the only place in the parish where large meetings could be held. We, with our school and parish-rooms, and with public halls obtainable at a moderate cost for any kind of gathering, are scarcely able to appreciate the difficulty which our forefathers had to undergo in respect to this matter.

Gross as was the irreverence fostered by the Church Ales, etc., it was nothing to what was done by the Puritans under Cromwell, when blasphemous plays were acted in churches dedicated to the service of God. "This valiant soldier of Christ [writes Foxe], the aforesaid Lord Cromwell, as he was studious of himself in a flagrant zeal to set forward the truth of the Gospel . . . . had about him such as could be found helpers and fartherers of the same; in the number of whom were sundry fresh and quick wits pertaining to his family, by whose industry and ingenious labours divers excellent ballads and books were contrived and set abroad concerning the suppression of the Pope and all Popish idolatry." It need scarcely be said that these ballads were of the most abominable type, and full of obscenity. Burnet states that "the political men of that party" made great use of stage plays and interludes, which were often acted in churches, "encouraging them all they could." In these plays the sacred rites of the Church were parodied in blasphemous fashion.

As an instance of how long Church abuses will survive, and long custom render people blind to acts of gross irreverence, I may quote the following which appeared in the *Standard* within the last four years:

"A curious custom was yesterday observed in the parish church of S. Ives, Hunts. Dr. Robert Wilde, who died in 1678, bequeathed £50, the yearly interest of which was to be expended in the purchase of six Bibles not exceeding the price of 7*s*. 6*d*. each, which should be 'cast for by dice' on the Communion Table every year by six boys and six girls of the town. A piece of ground was bought with the £50, and is now known as 'Bible Orchard.' The legacy also provided for the payment of 10*s*. yearly to the vicar for preaching a sermon on the occasion, 'commending the excellency, the perfection, and Divine authority of the

> Holy Scriptures.' This singular custom has been regularly observed in the church since the death of the testator; but representations having been made to the bishop of the diocese, the practice of throwing the dice on the Communion Table was discontinued some years ago, and the raffling now takes place on a table erected at the chancel steps. The highest throw this year (three times with three dice) was 37, by a little girl. The vicar preached a sermon from the words, 'From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures.'"

Among what may be termed Church frolics of olden time few, if any, are better known, by name at least, than that of the Boy Bishop. This burlesque ceremonial took place generally on December 6, the Festival of S. Nicholas, who was regarded as the patron of children. The proceedings were nothing more or less than a parody of some of the most sacred offices of the Church; and what is more, took place oftentimes in cathedrals with the full sanction of the clergy. With our modern ideas we have a difficulty in imagining how such profane buffoonery could in any age be tolerated, to say nothing of encouraged. Nevertheless, it continued as late as Henry VIII.'s reign. Thus we find so respectable a dignitary as Dean Colet in his Statutes of S. Paul's School in 1512, prescribing that the scholars should come on Holy Innocents Day to S. Paul's Church to hear the Childe Bishop's sermon, and after be at High Masse, and each of them offer a penny to the Childe Bishop. This burlesquing of holy rites was discontinued in 1542, and, excepting an attempt to revive it in Mary's reign, we hear no more of it.

I should not have called attention to it had it not been that a ceremonial with which most of us are familiar—the Eton Montem—is believed to have grown out of it. One of the usages thereat, which was observed until the middle of the last century, was undoubtedly a survival of the Boy Bishop's pageant. When the procession reached Salt Hill a boy dressed in clerical robes came forward and read prayers, whilst another boy officiated as clerk, who, at the end of the service, was kicked down hill by the parson. George III. was a great patron of the show, and encouraged it by handsome donations when the salt bearers came round; but the first time that Queen Charlotte saw this part of the frolic she was so shocked at its irreverence that it was from thenceforth abandoned. As we all know, the Eton Montem was finally abolished in 1847.

Apart from all reverential considerations, the nave of a church, according to our modern ideas, would seem to be about as inconvenient a place for a parish merry-making as could well be imagined. But it must be remembered that in the days of which we have been speaking, the naves of the churches were, to a great extent, devoid of furniture, and were simply large open spaces, such as are still to be seen in some of our cathedrals. The introduction of pews was very gradual. Most writers on the subject seem to consider that these fixed seats in churches were introduced in Henry VIII.'s reign; but this is incorrect. I find a notice of their existence nearly a hundred years before his time. A will, dated 1453, is extant in which the phrase "sedile vocatum pew" occurs. And what is more to the purpose, the churchwarden's accounts of the parish of S. Margaret's, Westminster, 1498–1500, contain the following entries of "Receytes of Pewes."

"ITEM. R: of the wyffe of the George for hir parte of a new Pewe, iij^{s}.
" R: of Will^{m}. Wynnes for his parte of a Pewe in the trinity Chapell, iij^{s}. iiij^{d}.
" R: of Will^{m}. Griffe & Thomas ffrost for licence to sette a pewe bi the Chirche dore, xij^{d}.
" of Jamys Hansettons wyfe and Juliane Notares wyfe for a pewe, xvj^{d}.
" R: of Wynkyns wyfe for hir parte of a Pewe, viij^{d}."

It would appear that the introduction of pews was not regarded with approval by the better part of the clergy. Latimer, who was consecrated Bishop of Worcester in 1535, disapproved of the innovation, and so did Bradford, who was Prebendary of S. Paul's about the same time, and Sir Thomas More also spoke against them. At this time the aged and infirm used portable stools, which appear to have been employed for many years. The well-known story of Jenny Geddes hurling her stool at the head of the Dean at S. Giles' Church, Edinburgh, when Charles I., at the instance of Archbishop Laud, introduced the new service book into Scotland, shows that in 1636 fixed seats had not become general in the North.

An instance of the official appropriation of fixed seats in church in the early part of the seventeenth century cannot fail to be interesting.

In the church books of Woodford Halse, Northamptonshire, the following appears:

"Primo die Maii anno Dni 1619.

"Memorand. it was agreed uppon the daie and yeare first above written by Mr Hawkins Vicar John Chappell George Handcocke Churchw. John Gibbs & Richard Rowse sides men that Thomas Hill of Hinton & his wife their heires and assignes shall sit in the uppermost seat in the North Ile next

> unto the pue of Hugh Catesby, Gent. as belonginge of right unto their new dwellinge Howse in Hinton for ever. As may appear more fullie by their Deede under their (several ?) handes for the better confirmacon hereof.
>
> "Primo die Maii Anno Dni 1619.
>
> "Memorand. it was agreed that uppon the daye and yeare first above written by Mr. Hawkins Vicar John Chappell George Handcocke Churchw. John Gibbs and Richard Rowse sides men that the third —— of the nethermost seat save one next unto the ffont and that next unto the —— of the said seate butting into the middle Alley of the Prsh Church of Woodford shall for ever hereafter remaine and bee as of right unto the new dwellinge howse of Thomas Cheeckley sittuate in Hinton and to his heires and assignes for ever as more at large may appeare (by their deede under their (several ?) hands (delivered ?) to the same Tho. Checkley by the above-named Mr. Hawkins Churchwardens and Sides men."

Another entry of the same date gives the original term "alley," which we have corrupted into "aisle"—"the seat butting into the middle alley." Alley is, of course, derived from the French *allée,* a passage, whilst "aisle" is from the French *aile,* a wing. To speak of the north and south aisles of a church is correct enough, because in using these terms we do not mean to signify the passages, but those portions of the structure which are on either side of the nave, and resemble in imagination the wings of a bird; but to talk about the "middle aisle," by which is always meant the passage up the nave, must be wrong, as it is absurd to talk about a middle wing.

Up to the middle of the present century a pew remained in the church of Geddington S. Mary, Northamptonshire, bearing on it the date 1602. When the church was reseated some fifty years ago, the dated panel was very judiciously worked into the door of the cupboard appropriated to the surplices. There was another pew in the same church dated 1604. Although, as it would seem, pews were not infrequent in town churches during Elizabeth's reign, I imagine that they were very rarely seen in small country villages like Geddington, and the fact of those mentioned above being dated seems to show that the church officials were rather proud of introducing a new fashion into such an out-of-the-way place. Indeed, considerably more than a hundred years after this—*i.e.,* in 1725—Swift, when enumerating the plagues of a country life, makes special mention of "a church without pews." It is evident that he altered his mind as he grew older, for when twenty years previously he wrote "Baucis and Philemon," we have him ridiculing pews in this fashion :—

> "A bedstead of the antique mode,
> Compact of timber many a load ;
> Such as our grandsires wont to use,
> Was metamorphosed into pews ;
> Which still their ancient nature keep,
> By lodging those disposed to sleep."

It is interesting to note how soon pews came to be abused, and made to minister to man's luxury and selfishness ; and how two centuries and a half ago the same complaint was made of them that is made now. Bishop Corbet of Norwich, who died 1635, in condemning these high private seats, declared that : "Stately pews are now become tabernacles, with rings and curtains to them. There wants nothing but beds to hear the Word of God on. We have casements, locks, keys, and cushions—I had almost said bolsters and pillows—and for these we love the Church ! I will not guess what is done in them ; who sits, stands, or lies asleep at prayers, communion, &c., but this I dare say, they are either to hide disorder, or to proclaim pride."

At this point I cannot refrain from borrowing a choice morsel from Mr. Abbey. After quoting from Mr. Beresford Hope's "Worship in the Church of England," to the effect that pews in modern days had been "sometimes filled with sofas and tables, and even provided with fire-places," he remarks that cases might be mentioned where the tedium of a long service, or the appetite engendered by it, were relieved by the entry between prayers and sermon of a liveried servant with sherry and light refreshments ; adding that such an instance was once mentioned to him by Bishop Eden, the late Primus of the Church in Scotland.

In connection with this question of pews I find that until about fifty years ago a most singular custom was annually observed at Otteringham, a village in Middle Holderness in the East Riding of Yorkshire. This took place on the even of Nov. 5, and was called "Flapping the Church." Each lad in the parish, having provided himself with a cord, to which was attached a stout piece of leather, about six inches long, proceeded to the church headed by the parish clerk. Being all assembled in the church, which was lighted up for the occasion, the ringers started a peal, and then the "flapping" began. The clerk shouted out, "Now, boys, flap away," and then all the pews in the church were assailed inside and out by the flappers. When the pews had been "flapped" for some time, the leather weapons were generally, at the end, directed by the boys against one another. The ceremony closed with a general steeplechase through the sacred building. At Roos, in Middle Holderness, there was a similar custom, but there it was called "Babbling." Also at Skirlaugh, in North Holderness, this ceremony was yearly observed.

There is another custom connected with the fabric of the church which is well worth recording. The account which I am able to give has been kindly furnished me by the Vicar of Cradley, in Staffordshire. I must give the substance of his letter in my own words. He tells me that what is called in his neighborhood "Clipping the Church" has prevailed for some time, although his parish is, comparatively speaking, a new one, dating from 1841, and the church was erected so late as 1798. The custom must therefore have been introduced in imitation of that prevalent in those parts—perhaps from Wolverhampton, as we shall see presently. The practice, he tells me, was for the children in the National Schools to join hand in hand all round the church, and to dance and shout. Last year, says the vicar, the first of my incumbency, I continued the practice, minus the dancing, and then assembled the children on the steps in front of the church, and after they had sung a hymn I gave them an address, explaining the custom to mean that the church belonged to them as baptised Christians. This year, as there was nothing of antiquity in the custom, I discontinued it, and found that I had gratified devout Church people by so doing. No such custom exists, or has existed, at the mother church of the parish —Halesowen—so far as the vicar knows.

My correspondent has been good enough to send me a volume descriptive of certain matters connected with the parish of Bradford-on-Avon, written by the Rev. W. H. Jones, an antiquary of repute, and published in 1859. Amongst these is that of "Clipping the Church."

It seems that at Bradford, Shrove Tuesday is the occasion when this ceremony takes place, but why this day was set apart for the ceremony it is impossible to say, or, indeed, what was the origin of the custom itself. And here I must, to a great extent, put Mr. Jones' remarks into my own words, or rather, I must compress his matter in such wise as to prevent me from marking it as an actual quotation.

If this curious ancient usage were observed on Trinity Monday, the Dedication Festival of the Church, it might be taken as a relic of the old sports and pastimes usual on such occasions. In days of yore fairs were commonly held in churchyards, and no long time ago one was annually held in that of St. James', Bristol, when people thought little of dancing about the church. The custom of dancing in the churchyard during feasts and revels has been universal in Radnorshire, and very common in other parts of Wales. Indeed, this solemn abode is used as a kind of circus for sports. People were wont to play at fives and tennis against the walls of the church. They did not dance on the graves, but on the north side of the church, where there were no graves. Thus it was at Bradford at the time of the yearly fair, and the south wall of the church tower shows unmistakable evidences of having been used for the balls of the tennis-players. The boys' dance round the church, however, formed no part of the ceremonies of the Trinity season.

This dance may be a relic of some very ancient observances, and it is not impossible that it may be connected in a way with the ancient Baal worship.

In days when Baal (the Sun) was the chief object of worship, as in ancient Britain, and many other countries, a circular dance, in allusion to the sun's supposed motion round the earth, formed part of the ceremonial. Many British monuments are in a circular form, as Stonehenge, Abury, etc. Stonehenge was called "The Giant's Dance," and a circle in Cornwall is termed "Dance Maine," "Dance Stones." A tradition of this circular dancing appears in many fables respecting Druidical temples in England. The stones are said to be human beings petrified in the midst of a dance, and all the temples to which such superstitions once attached are circular. At Stanton Drew the stones are called "The Wedding," and one of them is especially termed "The Bride," and the tradition says that the men and women were all turned to stone at a wedding festival.

It was suggested above that the custom of "Clipping the Church" at Cradley may have been borrowed from the neighboring town of Wolverhampton, where at the beginning of the present century a number of boys "at holyday time" used to collect together, and, taking hold of hands, to proceed along the streets until they had gathered a sufficient number to enable them to clip S. John's Church. The dancing and shouting described above then took place. It is said that occasionally even the large Collegiate Church at Wolverhampton was clipped. In Hone's "Every Day Book," it is said that at the latter part of the last century this custom prevailed in Birmingham.

Most people are aware that in ancient times the privilege of sanctuary was accorded to persons who broke the laws, and who were able to reach a church before they were apprehended. In some instances, this protection extended to those who set foot within the cathedral or church precincts. Mr. Walcot states that this privilege pertained to Durham, Westminster, Carron, Ramsey, Crowland, Ripon, Tintern, Leominster, and Worcester. In some places the church itself only was available for sanctuary. Thus at Hexham, and at S. Gregory's, Norwich, a ring-knocker still remains on the north door. This was for the use of persons flying from justice. Alsatia, the precinct of Whitefriars, London, was the last sanctuary in use before the privilege was wholly abolished in the twenty-first year of the reign of James I. (1624).

A curious relic of this old privilege, however, survived. The Rector of Diss, Norfolk, has told me that in the overseers' accounts for the year 1687 in that parish, among the disbursements of one Samuel Foulger, the folowing entry appears :

> "To the wench Ellenor, that laye in the Church porch at several times, 00 . 7 . 6 ."

The Rector adds : "She was no doubt a pauper, whom the overseers lodged in the chamber of the porch. I do not find any similar entries. There is no tradition on the subject."

As a curious traditionary usage akin to the above the following is of interest, as it brings down to the middle of the present century, the fact of the church being regarded as a place of general refuge for the unfortunate.

The Rector of West Tofts, Norfolk—referring to a communication of his to *Notes and Queries,* to the effect that a poor woman, whose relations had gone to America, applied to him as a magistrate for advice and assistance, as she and her family had become houseless, and were obliged to take up their abode in the church porch—tells me that the privilege had previously been used by a family living in an adjoining parish, the members of which had been ejected from their cottage.

Even before the abolition of "Sanctuary" in the older sense of the term, the church porch seems to have been regarded as a kind of refuge for the destitute. A former Vicar of Flamstead, near Dunstable, has sent me the following extract from the burial register of that parish :

> "Buriales, ano 1578. 51.
>
> "On the xxvth November, buried Margerye Roadinge, a poor child.
>
> "52. On the xxvith November buried Robert Roadinge, father unto the sayde child, which bothe died in ye Churche porche."

The vicar informs me that : "Tradition says there is a right of refuge attached to our north porch," but that he cannot verify nor explain it. It was in the north porch that the two people above mentioned died.

I may add that in olden days, the church porch was often used as a place for the payment of debts, and for other such like matters, simply, as I presume, because it was a very public place, where there were sure to be witnesses. I have heard of dead bodies being laid in the church porch for identification.

CHARLES HADDON SPURGEON.

BY THE EDITOR OF THE "BRITISH WEEKLY," REV. PRINCIPAL EDWARDS, MR. RUSKIN, PRINCIPAL TULLOCH, AND GEORGE ELIOT.

From *The British Weekly* (Non-Conformist), London, February 4, 1892.

WHILE the great congregations at the Metropolitan Tabernacle assembled on Sunday, their minister was lying unconscious at the doors of dawn. Ere the Sabbath ended he had passed through. The day for so long of his honourable toil was the day of his sacred rest—the day when he was gathered to the great host of his spiritual children who had gone before.

He has fallen like a tower, and his removal means for many a change in the whole landscape of life. A London Tory newspaper spoke of his death as attracting much less attention than that of Cardinal Manning. What did the children at the schools, the servants in the kitchen, the cotters in the Highlands, the old women in wretched garrets, know of Manning ? But all these—all the nation, for the nation is Christian still —knew Spurgeon. In Scotland he was even more regarded than in England, and in America perhaps his fame stood higher than anywhere else. It is nearly thirty years since he said, not boastfully, but with perfect truth, "Our word girds the world, and our testimony belts the globe." His years were not many when he died, but he had lived long, and had maintained to the very last the splendour of his fame. Had Mr. Gladstone died at Mr. Spurgeon's age, he would by this time have been completely forgotten. Even as it was, Mr. Spurgeon was to the majority of his countrymen a still more conspicuous figure than Mr. Gladstone ; it is not too much to say he was venerated beyond all other men.

The popular judgment is often mistaken ; but it may be trusted to detect a charlatan *in time.* For the public ear, though easy to gain, is exceedingly hard to keep. It says much both for the power and the essential integrity of Mr. Spurgeon that he caught it when a mere boy, and never lost it for a moment. This was due first of all to his oratorical power. Two orators of the first rank have appeared in our time : Mr. Bright and Mr. Spurgeon. His marvellous voice, clear as a silver bell's and winning as a woman's, rose up against the surging multitude, and without effort entered every ear. The homely, sturdy Englishman, with his air of composed mastery, his unfailing command of lucid Saxon, his power to rise on occasion to the heights of eloquence, his compassionate understanding of the life of his people, and above all, his yearning for their salvation, will not easily pass from the nation's memory and heart. Mr. Spurgeon's almost supernatural keenness of observation was a great element of his influence. A well-known neighbour of his has never been able to recognise his members, because he cannot recall faces. It is not a fault ; but it is a misfortune. Mr. Spurgeon at one time, as he sat on his platform, could name every one of his five thousand members. He also remembered even visitors with whom he had a very slight acquaintance ; and when they came to the Tabernacle, instantly detected them. He was pretty sure to contrive some way of making signs to them before the service ended—in manners sometimes quaint enough.

He was, however, much more than a great orator. The present writer, thrown on one occasion for six months where books were scarce, commenced to read a complete set of the *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, and went through all the volumes. We can hardly imagine any one doing this without receiving a profound and permanent impression. More, the astonishing ability of the preacher is as marked as his eloquence and his sincerity. In this respect he has hardly received justice. Many talk still of his "crab-apple fertility," and compare him compassionately with such men as Liddon. In truth, there was no comparison ; in point of sheer ability, Spurgeon was as far above Liddon as Liddon was above Farrar. As an unprejudiced and competent critic, the Rev. H. R. Haweis, said many years ago, "It is perfectly extraordinary how able and powerful the great Baptist can be within his very narrow doctrinal limits." We do not think that he succeeded to any great extent outside of the sermons, although his "John Ploughman" publications contain much racy matter. In the sermons there are many passages which a really catholic anthology of English prose would not omit, and an informing spirit which hardly breathes among us now.

It may seem a hard saying, but it cannot be doubted that his theology was a main element in his lasting attraction. Why has Calvinism flourished so exceedingly in the damp, low-lying, thickly peopled, struggling regions of South London—where James Wells, an utterly uneducated man, and a Calvinist so high that he thought Mr. Spurgeon a dangerous heretic, divided the honours with his young neighbour, and had such a funeral as South London had never seen before? To begin with, all religions for the masses are essentially the same. A Roman Catholic theologian, Father Dalgairns, says : "Go and preach your uncertain Hell and your obscure Atonement in the streets of our large towns, how many proselytes will you gain among the masses, the stench of whose corruptions goes up to heaven more foully every day ? You tempt them by the dubious boon of a universal salvation, but in so doing you deprive them of the consolation of a Saviour." Mr. Spurgeon always made salvation a wonderful, a supernatural thing—won through battle and agony and garments rolled in blood. That the blood of God should be one of the ordinary forces of the universe was to him a thing incredible.

This great and hard-won salvation was sure ; that is, "it did not stand in the creature ;" it rested absolutely with God. It was not of man, nor of the will of the flesh. Mr. Spurgeon's hearers had many of them missed all the prizes of life ; but God did not choose them for the reasons that move man's preference, else their case were hopeless. Their election was of grace. And as He chose them, He would keep them. The perseverance of the saints is a doctrine without meaning to the majority of Christians. But many a poor girl with the love of Christ and goodness in her heart, working her fingers to the bone for a pittance that just keeps her alive, with the temptations of the streets around her, and the river beside her, listened with all her soul when she heard that Christ's sheep could never perish. Many a struggling tradesman tempted to dishonesty ; many a widow with penury and loneliness before her, were lifted above all, taught to look through and over the years coming thick with sorrow and conflict, and anticipate a place in the Church Triumphant.

There is a very prevalent notion that the doctrine of a universal Fatherhood as often preached, springs from a truer charity and is more comforting than the old way of teaching that God is the Father of His children through faith. A man says, "God is the Father of the East-end of London," and thinks he has uttered a consoling truth. What Mr. Spurgeon felt was that the Fatherhood of God must mean a great deal more than that. In a sense God is the Father of the most degraded, but what does that come to? Before we know the Fatherly nature the Son must reveal it, and if we dare to say it, there is something beyond that. The going out of the Divine Heart to poor, lost, guilty creatures is an expression of the lower deep of love in God's own being, and means something—means everything for as many as receive it. It is not the cold comfort, the unsheltering shadow of an empty phrase.

The very poor—it must be remembered that South London is the poorest part of the metropolis—are beginning to hope that councils and parliaments will do much for them. They may find it so, but Mr. Spurgeon made little of such things. He taught them—the staple of his sermons is—that now in the living communion of the soul with Christ, they might have all the joy they needed. A man too wise, too experienced, not to know how slowly the battles of the poor are won, and how little their victories often yield—he insisted on the joy and peace in believing, which the world could neither give nor take away. Life might pursue its hard, monotonous way of obscure toil, scanty wages, and a great weight of care, but over it all there might rest a soft and sacred light. The common people heard this gladly, and well they might, for it is so. Perhaps when they have had a little more experience of the politician they will hear it more gladly than ever.

Personally Mr. Spurgeon was keenly alive to the humorous side of things—witty, brilliant, and sometimes exuberant. But as is so often the case with such natures, his thoughts turned habitually to the wistful, pathetic, melancholy side of life. George Herbert's lines fitted him well:

"Not that he may not here
Taste of the cheer,
But as birds drink and straight lift up their head,
So must he sip and think
Of better drink
He may attain to after he is dead.

"But as his joys are double,
So is his trouble;
He hath two winters, other things but one;
Both frosts and thoughts do nip
And bite his lip;
And he of all things fears two deaths alone."

In manner he was scrupulously and even anxiously courteous. For long he mixed little in society; he was busy with his tremendous labour, and incessantly occupied in reading. He had a great collection of commentaries arranged in order round the walls of his sanctum, and never preached without consulting each on his text. Though his habits of preparation were peculiar, they were thorough and exact. Never did he trifle with the chief duty of his sacred office.

But we must leave many things unsaid. Never has a man with such an experience appeared in the Christian Church—never one who has addressed so many of his fellow-creatures on the things of God—never one the obvious results of whose ministry have been so great. "I shall never hear you calling," we say as we think of that unforgotten voice. But its echoes will linger when the strife of tongues is passing. Multitudes will think with affectionate and respectful sympathy of the bereaved wife and sons and of the great church over which he presided. We have all lost much, but he has gained more. His was a nature little fitted for many things that befell him in the last lacerating years—less fitted still for the long inaction which was the best his physicians dared to hope for. Better for him, better, perhaps, for us, that he has gone up the shining road.

A Reminiscence by Rev. Principal Edwards, D.D., Bala College.

In an address on preaching, given to the students of this college last Saturday, I ventured to say that Mr. Spurgeon was the only preacher I had ever heard from whose lips the preacher's language seemed to me at the time quite adequate to express the truths of the Gospel. The remark was blurted out on the spur of the moment—perhaps too incautiously. Still, in thinking it over afterward, I could not thrust away the conviction that great preachers seem often to be themselves oppressed with an uneasy sense of inability to convey to their hearers the depth and richness of Christian thoughts. It betrays itself sometimes in an exaggerated action, sometimes in repetition of the same idea in different words. Nothing of this appeared in Mr. Spurgeon. His theology was the hardest of all theologies to couch in ordinary language. One step beyond it would have plunged him into scholastic metaphysics. Yet he was perfectly at his ease, and seemed to revel in preaching the profoundest mysteries of Christianity to the common people. The first time I heard him, it was this that made the most lasting impression on me—this next after his marvellous voice. For I had heard great preachers in my own land. But they toiled in preaching, and the notion was firmly fixed in my mind that to preach easily was to preach badly. I went home convinced that the newspapers were not far wrong in calling Mr. Spurgeon a nine days' wonder, if the still severer condemnation said to have been pronounced by Mr. Binney, whom I admired then and now revere, had not, after all, hit the mark. I have long ago changed my mind. It was Mr. Spurgeon's transcendent greatness as a preacher, that he could do with apparent ease what many other great preachers cannot do without a painful appearance of effort. What is the explanation of his masterful repose? For one thing, though he was very original in his way, he was not a speculative theologian, struggling to give tongue to new thoughts. What he saw he saw as clear as sunlight, and what he did not see with perfect clearness he did not see at all. He was like Chalmers, who could walk round an idea, not like Edward Irving, whose ideas "loomed." Will not this in some measure account for Mr. Spurgeon's attitude in reference to the down-grade controversy? Though one short step would have brought him face to face with weird and threatening shapes, he could resist the temptation to take that fateful step, or, rather, he could neither have taken it nor felt the temptation to do so. Again, he was steeped in the language of the seventeenth century, and this was the natural, fit, and powerful expression of a great and strong theology. Whether the Calvinism of the Puritans is true or not, to say the least, it is a great theology, and Spurgeon believed it to be, not only true, but the whole truth of God. Not, certainly, that he spoke to his own age in the cumbersome, if majestic, phraseology of Hooker or Howe. But his beliefs were thought and hammered out in the language of a past generation, and whenever the English of Mr. Bright would not express satisfactorily a theological idea, which Mr. Spurgeon felt he must preach, he found ample stores to his hand in the Puritan divines. He was really master of two languages, the language of a theological past, and the non-theological language of the nineteenth century.

For my part, I went to hear Mr. Spurgeon as often as I could, partly to learn how to preach, and partly also from a feeling of joyful gratitude. For is it not the simple truth that England was beginning to despair of the pulpit when Spurgeon suddenly appeared? He, at least, could not be predicted beforehand, and could not be accounted for when he came. Ever since we have all believed, with new confidence, that preaching will continue in the Church to the age of ages, and that a great preacher is Christ's last resource.

THREE ESTIMATES.

MR. RUSKIN.

Mr. Ruskin wrote in his "Letters on the Lord's Prayer": I am now sixty years old, and for forty-five of them was in church at least once on the Sunday—say once a month also in the afternoons—and you have above three thousand church services. When I am abroad I am often in half-a-dozen churches in the course of a single day, and never lose a chance of listening to anything that is going on. Add the conversations pursued, not unearnestly, with every sort of reverent person I can get to talk to me—from the Bishop of Strasburg (as good a specimen of a town bishop as I have known), with whom I was studying ecstatic paintings in the year 1850, down to the simplest travelling tinker inclined Gospelwards, whom I perceive to be sincere, and your correspondent will perceive that my rapid numerical expression must be far beneath the truth. He subjoins his more rational doubt of my acquaintance with many town missionaries, to which I can only answer, that as I do not live in town, nor set up for a missionary myself, my spiritual advantages have certainly not been great in that direction. I simply assert that of the few I have known —beginning with Mr. Spurgeon, under whom I sat with much edification for a year or two,—I have not known of any such teaching as I speak of.

Referring to the book in the *Sword and Trowel*, Mr. Spurgeon said, "For Mr. Ruskin we always feel something more than respect, and we cannot criticise him or be criticised by him, without regret. He has always had a warm side towards C. H. Spurgeon, and even in this volume he speaks of 'Mr. Spurgeon, under whom I sat with much edification for a year or two.'"

PRINCIPAL TULLOCH.

The following letter to Mrs. Tulloch is given in Mrs. Oliphant's Life of the Principal :—We have just been to hear Spurgeon, and have been both so much impressed that I wish to give you my impressions while they are fresh. As we came out we both confessed, "There is no doubt about that," and I was struck with Ferrier's remarkable expression, "I feel it would do me good to hear the like of that, it sat so close to reality." The sermon is about the most real thing I have come in contact with for a long time. Guthrie is a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal to it ; and although there is not the elevated thought and descriptive felicity of Caird (the latter especially, however, not wanting), there is more power. Power in fact and life are its characteristics, and I could not help being pleased that I had hit upon the man pretty well in the notice of him along with Robertson and Guthrie, which was never published. The place is fully adapted for preaching, being the largest, highest, and airiest building I ever saw. It was crammed, of course, but not in the least uncomfortable, as round all the thickly studded benches there was a wide and open corridor, with window-doors open, out and in of which you could walk into the gardens (Surrey gardens) as you liked ; and Ferrier kept taking a turn now and then during the sermon. He began the Service with a short prayer, then sang the 23rd Psalm, but instead of our fine old version, some vile version, in which the simple beauty of the hymn is entirely lost. Then he read and expounded the 32nd chapter (I think) of Numbers. His remarks were very good and to the point, with no display or misplaced emotion. He then prayed more at length, and this was the part of the service I least liked. He preached from the same chapter he read, about the spies from the land of Canaan—the good and bad spies. It was a parable, he said, of religion. Then after speaking of men of the world judging religion (which however they had no right to do) from those who professed it rather than from the Bible—which in thought and grasp was the fullest part of the sermon—he said he would speak of two classes of people, the bad spies first and then the good spies, those who made a great ado about religion and did not show its power. This description here was graphic beyond what I can give you an idea of ; the most telling satire, cutting home yet not overdone, as he spoke of the gloomy religionist who brought up a bad report of the land of religion, making himself and his wife and children miserable, drawing down the blinds on a Sunday, "always most religious when most miserable, and most miserable when most religious," then the meek-faced fellow who can pray all Sunday and preach by the hour, and cheat all Monday, always ready with his prayer book, but keeping a singular cash book, wouldn't swear, but would cheat and lie. Then again he showed still higher powers of pathos in describing the good spies—the old blind saint who had served God for fifty years and never found him fail ; the consumptive girl testifying of the goodness of her Saviour as the dews of death gathered on her brow. And then of all who only lived as Christians —the good wife who converted her husband by her untiring gentleness, and having supper ready even at twelve o'clock at night ; the servant who because she was religious, cleaned knives better without losing their edge ; the Christian merchant ; the wife who, unknown to fame, and having no time for teaching or district visiting, achieved her household work day by day.

In fact, the whole was a wonderful display of mental vigour and Christian sense, and gave me a good idea of what good such a man may do. The impression made upon Ferrier, which he has just read over to me as he has written it to his wife, is "driving downright." He improves in look too a little as he warms in preaching. At first he certainly is not interesting in face or figure —very fat and podgy ; but there is no doubt of the fellow, look as he may. His voice is of rare felicity, as clear as a bell—not a syllable lost.

GEORGE ELIOT.

The following rather ill-natured criticism occurs in Mr. Cross's Memoir of George Eliot. That the reference is to Mr. Spurgeon is sufficiently plain, and is made certain by the fact that the date mentioned is a Thursday. George Eliot and Mr. Lewes had evidently attended the Metropolitan Tabernacle Thursday evening lecture.

"Yesterday, for the first time, we went to hear A. (a popular preacher). I remembered what you had said about his vulgar, false emphasis ; but there remained the fact of his celebrity. I was glad of the opportunity. But my impressions fell below the lowest judgment I ever heard passed upon him. He has the gift of a fine voice, very flexible and various ; he is admirably fluent and clear in his language, and every now and then his enunciation is effective. But I never heard any pulpit reading and speaking which, in its level tone, was more utterly common and empty of guiding intelligence or emotion : it was as if the words had been learned by heart and uttered without comprehension by a man who had no instinct of rhythm or music in his soul. And the doctrine! It was a libel on Calvinism that it should be presented in such a form. I never heard any attempt to exhibit the soul's experience that was more destitute of insight. The sermon was against Fear, in the elect Christian, as being a distrust of God; but never once did he touch the true ground of fear—the doubt whether the signs of God's choice are present in the soul. We had plenty of anecdotes, but they were all poor and pointless—Tract Society anecdotes of the feeblest kind. It was the most superficial grocer's back-parlour view of Calvinistic Christianity; and I was shocked to find how low the mental pitch of our society must be, judged by the standard of this man's celebrity.

"Mr. Lewes was struck with some of his tones as good actor's tones, and was not so wroth as I was. But just now, with all Europe stirred by events that make every conscience tremble after some great principle as a consolation and guide, it was too exasperating to sit and listen to doctrine that seemed to look no further than the retail Christian's tea and muffins. He said, 'Let us approach the throne of God,' very much as he might have invited you to take a chair; and then followed this fine touch—'We feel no love to God because He hears the prayers of others: it is because He hears *my* prayer that I love Him.'"

DR. ABRAHAM KUENEN.

Born September 16th, 1828; died December 10th, 1891.

His Life and Work.

BY PROFESSOR C. H. TOY.

From *The Christian Register* (Unit.), Boston, January 21, 1892.

The news of Kuenen's death came as an unexpected shock to his friends in America. It was known that he was ill; but we were not prepared for this sudden termination of his life. He was in the vigor of his age—just a little over sixty-three years old—and was engaged in the revision of one of his most important works. Articles had appeared from him in some of the latest numbers of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*. It was hoped that he had before him yet many years of activity. His death makes a great gap in the ranks of Old Testament critics. To him Old Testament students had looked, not only with reverence for his long service and great learning, but also with confidence in the calmness and equity of his judgment. Now that he is gone, the Christian world, it is hardly too much to say, is filled with grief at his loss.

The details of his life have not yet been made public. It seems to have been passed in the peaceful pursuit of knowledge, out of the current of controversy, except such scholarly discussion as was excited by his critical works. He became professor in the University of Leiden when he was about twenty-five years old, and remained in this position up to his death. Though looked on by many as a radical and revolutionary writer, his tone was never such as to stir bitter feeling in his opponents. On the contrary, it was marked by such urbanity and fairness as could scarcely fail to impress even those whom he most seriously assailed. His career, if we may judge from what we now know of it, appears to have been one of uncommon peacefulness. He lived to witness a great triumph for opinions which, when he first espoused them, were widely regarded as subversive of religion. He continued his literary activity up to no great time before his death, and had the satisfaction of knowing that he left behind him works which would be for a long time to come guides and inspirers in some of the most serious studies of men.

He was fortunate in beginning his professional career at a turning-point in the history of Old Testament criticism, still more fortunate in being able to seize the dominant idea in a masterful way, and develop it with transcendent skill and power. When he became professor in 1853, De Wette had been dead only four years, and in that same year appeared the second edition of the latter part of Ewald's "History of Israel." De Wette and Ewald represent the highest point reached by the critical efforts of the first half of our century. There was freedom of inquiry enough; but the key to the history of the Old Testament development had not yet been found. It was under the influence of these writers that Kuenen produced his first critical work—a treatise on the origin of the books of the Old Testament. This work, written in Dutch, and translated into French, has never appeared, I believe, in English form; but it does not represent his mature views, and he was preparing a new edition of it at the time of his death.

The turning point in his own critical thought was produced by the work of Graf on "The Historical Books of the Old Testament," which appeared in 1866. Graf undertook to show that the ritual legislation was the latest portion of the Pentateuchal codes, and that it was exilian or post-exilian. So soon as this order of origination was pointed out, Kuenen felt that it supplied what he himself had been seeking. He accepted Graf's view, not merely because he felt the force of Graf's arguments, but because this hypothesis at once, to his mind, disposed of doubts which he had long felt, and for the first time gave rational order to the details of the Pentateuchal legislation. But he did more than this; he perceived that, in going thus far with Graf, it became necessary to go further. The German scholar had confined most of his investigation to the ritual literature, and had stood by the prevailing opinion that the Elohistic historical narratives were earlier than the Yahwistic. But Kuenen saw that the two, the ritual and the historical parts, must go together, and that Graf's principles, if accepted, would lead, necessarily, to the acceptance of a post-exilian origin for a considerable part of the historical matter of the Pentateuch. This conclusion he announced to Graf himself, who also recognized its correctness and accepted it. Graf did not live to complete the inquiry he had begun, and the duty of defending the new opinions fell chiefly upon Kuenen. For a long time the critical world stood aloof from what seemed a complete overturning of the accepted views. England and France did not concern themselves with the new theory, and Germany turned a deaf ear to it. Kuenen has himself given a most vivid picture of the struggle which arose out of the announcement of Graf's position. Little by little his view gained ground, and now numbers among its adherents a great majority of the foremost Biblical critics of the world. To this result Kuenen contributed in a very large degree. His literary activity was incessant; in addition to his books, he wrote a large number of articles for the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* and other periodicals, and threw off from time to time contributions to Biblical criticism of very great value, which, it is to be hoped, will be collected and translated into English.

The first book which he wrote after the change in his critcial point of view was "The History of the Religion of Israel," which appeared in Dutch in 1869–70, and in English translation in 1874–75. This work is so well known that it hardly calls for special description. One does not know, in reading it, which most to admire—the fulness of its learning, its critical acumen, or the admirable power of literary presentation which it exhibits. It has now become a manual for students of the Old Testament, and it is hard for those who have grown familiar with its thought to realize the commotion it produced on its first appearance. It presented the Grafian view in a form intelligible to the ordinary reader, and it arranged the facts of the Old Testament history with so much precision and skill that few readers could fail to be carried along by the evidence. It goes over the entire ground, from the earliest known period down to the time immediately preceding the beginning of our era, and shows everywhere a surprising justness of view and breadth of intellectual sympathy. Kuenen had the power which is characteristic of epoch-making scholars, of recognizing and seizing on the best results of other men's labors, and using them in illustration of his own theme.

His work on "The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel," which appeared in Holland in 1875, and in English translation in 1877, is not as well known as his "History of the Israelitish Religion," but is in some respects no less noteworthy. On its face it seems to be purely destructive. It is mainly devoted to showing that the work of the prophets can be completely understood without the supposition of a supernatural element. He examines the predictions one by one, and the fulfilments of them which are supposed to have occurred, the prophets' own consciousness of a divine mission, and the claims which they put forth, and finds in all of this nothing but the work of great moral teachers, who, so far as an infusion of supernatural energy is concerned, are not to be distinguished from other great moral teachers of the world. But it must be added that he does not content himself with this negative presentation. While undertaking to strip the prophets of all claim to special supernatural guidance, he assigns them an exalted place in the history of religious development. As is well known, he regards them as the constructors of the doctrine of Monotheism, and therefore as the most effective builders of the national religious life of Israel. In this way he comes to regard them as of enormous significance for the religious life of the whole world. It would be a great mistake to regard Kuenen, in this work or in any other, as an unfeeling analyst. He is always animated by a profound sympathy with the deeper religious experience of men, and with the divine side of human life. This book on "Prophecy" is full of instruction, of keen and interesting analysis, of sharp-sighted combinations, and furnishes a vast amount of illustration for the history of the religion of Israel. In

1882 Kuenen, in his Hibbert Lectures, left his immediate field of Old Testament history, and made an excursion into the general history of religions. In these lectures he gives a lucid exposition of the differences between national religions and universal religions, and makes a detailed examination of the claims of Islam to the title of universal. The principles which he here lays down admit of a general application, and may be considered as a contribution to the science of the history of religions. It is a loss for us that he did not have occasion to go more largely into this study. With his wide learning and well rounded thought, he would certainly have produced other material of great value. Yet, after all, the Old Testament was his chosen field, and to it he devoted the last years of his life. He felt the necessity of revising thoroughly his early work on "The History of the Old Hebrew Literature." The first part of the first volume of the revision, on the Hexateuch, appeared in English translation in 1866, and is the best existing exhibition of the present state of Hexateuchal criticism. It is a *thesaurus* of critical learning and thought, and will probably be the handbook in this part of the Old Testament for many years to come. The second part of the first volume, comprising the historical books, and the second volume, comprising the prophetical books (including also Daniel), have appeared in Dutch, but have not yet been translated into English. They exhibit the same fulness of material, skill in presentation and maturity of judgment that distinguish the volume on the Hexateuch. It is to be hoped that he has left the materials for the concluding volume in such form as to admit of publication, though, according to the statements of Mr. Wicksteed, this does not seem to be probable. Now that the critical questions relating to the Psalter and the Wisdom-books are assuming greater prominence, it would be very helpful to have Kuenen's final opinions on the date, origin, and religious conceptions of these works.

He was cut off in the midst of his labors, but the sum of his works is large and inspiring. He entered early one of the great battle-grounds of the time, and kept his position firmly to the end. He is an example to all men of conscientiousness in research and honesty in thinking. He was reverent toward all that he esteemed high and noble. However sharp his attack on what seemed to many persons to be eternal truth, he never failed in piety toward what he himself thought to be truth. In his private relations he is described as having been very attractive. Calm and gentle in bearing, sympathetic toward all, ready to give help to any who needed his service, he seems to have been a simple, genial, kindly character. Notwithstanding his devotion to study, he took part in many social organizations, religious and other. He leaves behind him the picture of a strong and efficient personality and the record of a faithful life.

BAPTISTS, UNIVERSALISTS, AND UNITARIANS.

Ought They to be Consolidated?

BY JESSE B. THOMAS, D.D.

From *The Watchman* (Bapt.), Boston, January 28, 1892.

The notion of an amalgamation of the various "evangelical" denominations into a single "church," or even into permanent and definite alliance, in any corporate form, has probably ceased to command any extensive interest. Discussion has inevitably disclosed an inveteracy of attachment to some peculiarity in rite, organization, or conception of clerical function that became a bar to further progress.

But there is evidently an impression in some quarters that the wall of partition between the "evangelical" party—especially the Baptist section of it—and the "liberals," being doctrinal only, is much more ethereal, and that the hindrances to interfusion are therefore much less formidable. The secular press has been unusually generous of late in its encomiums and congratulations because of current manifestations of Baptist fidelity to the denominational tradition of "soul-liberty;" a word of fraternal counsel and caution being sometimes added, as if there were fear that some injudicious church or editor might damage this growing reputation by some untimely allusion to Baptist history. It is certain that the lack of a formal creed has never in fact justified the inference that Baptists have lacked a definite outline of faith, nor has their passion for soul-liberty logically brought them the credit of ultra fusibility. On the contrary, their notions of responsibility seem to have kept pace with those of liberty to a degree that has made them dissenters among the dissenters, and logically forced them into an attitude of isolation so complete as to bring upon them caustic criticism as waywardly separatist in temper.

It is not to be overlooked, however, that some recent occurrences and accompanying comment have given occasion to some such impression as that referred to.

The withdrawal of a popular and brilliant preacher in New York from the Baptist pulpit, not long since, was made the occasion of remonstrance, not only in the secular press, but in some Baptist newspaper correspondence, upon grounds that may well challenge attention. It was pretty clearly intimated that the adoption and propagation of Universalist doctrine by a Baptist pastor was no sufficient ground for serious dissatisfaction on the part of his church, and that his withdrawal from the denomination because of criticism for such utterances betrayed superfluous sensitiveness on his part, based on a misapprehension of the really "liberal" sentiment of the denomination, which would have sustained him in refusal to withdraw.

A more recent occurrence might be cited to the same effect. A scholar of high reputation, presumably capable of saying with some precision what he meant, so outlined his religious views before the Unitarian Club in Boston, a few nights since, as to elicit the response from one of the least conservative of Unitarians (as currently reported) that he did not care a fig whether a man who talked like that was Unitarian or not—he was certainly inspired by the spirit which was at the heart of the Unitarian movement. And yet the learned gentleman thus welcomed as an ally of Unitarianism had been received but a few days before into a Baptist church upon the basis of a personal "confession of faith," since widely published, in which was embodied a distinct protest against "dogmatic faith" in any form. Such circumstances, reinforced by the confident inferences of oracular editors without, and the sentimental exuberances of unofficial newspaper correspondents within, might easily lead to generalizations as misleading as they are specious.

It is curious that nobody seems to have called attention to a matter seemingly much more significant in this connection than such sporadic circumstances, viz.: the actual affinity in history and doctrine of the Baptists with both Universalists and Unitarians. The doctrine of church independency, the rejection of creeds, the passion for "soul-liberty," have been common to all alike from their origin.

More than this, the early Universalists in this country were predominantly Baptist, many of their churches to this day repudiating infant baptism. Elhanan Winchester and Hosea Ballou, who had both been Baptist ministers, remained earnest in warfare upon perversion of the ordinances after adopting Universalism; the early association established by the former having been a "Universal Baptist Association." The Universalists, to be sure, departed from Baptist simplicity, in adopting a formal creed—but it is sufficiently thin and elastic in statement to give room for ample diversity of opinion.

The Unitarians as far back as the Reformation were Anabaptists. Socinus remonstrated with his Polish colleagues for refusing to admit to membership or even to communion those who had not been immersed as adults. Nor did they (as the usually accurate Prof. Fisher, in his Church History, intimates) resume the practice of infant baptism under his influence. The Racovian Catechism distinctly reaffirms that there can be no baptism except adult immersion, and consents only to "tolerate the error" of infant baptism, inasmuch as its practisers "do not persecute."

In England, also, Unitarians and Anabaptists were long confused in popular apprehension, and a section of the General Baptists still finds record in the Unitarian Year Book as a part of the Unitarian body.

But these facts, far from justifying the fantastic idea of radical affinity of sentiment or approximating relation in form between the Baptists and the "liberals," help, rather, to show how delusive and preposterous is such a dream.

The Reformation, which shattered the old doctrinal and ecclesiastical organism, left its dissolved elements free to reorganize by elective affinity. The first groupings were naturally determined by certain general and impulsive currents of sympathy. All anti-sacramentarians, all anti-traditionalists, all ecclesiastic democrats, naturally fell together for the time. But such affiliations were superficial and ephemeral. Partition began speedily among the Anabaptists—anti-Trinitarians being extruded as incongruous. Very speedily those who clung to the Deity of Christ, who made His commands ultimate in authority, accepting them literally, and holding them to be definite and level to the apprehension of the common people, crystallized apart into the body now known as "the Baptists." Henceforth, the chasm between Trinitarian and anti-Trinitarian, as illustrated in Baptist sentiment, has deepened and widened. How impassable it had become in early New England let the ecclesiastical history of that time declare. "In the territory now within the limits of Boston," says the venerable Dr. Peabody, "there were, a century ago, but two professed Trinitarian ministers—one of them being Dr. Thatcher, of the liberal Brattle Square Church, while Dr. Eckly, of the Old South Church, was known to entertain doubts of the deity of Christ."

In the enthusiasm of reminiscence of the victories of Unitarianism, Dr. Peabody manifestly forgot to limit the term "Trinitarian minister" by the qualifying adjective, "Congregational," for the illustrious Stillman, with the First Baptist Church of which he was pastor, and Baldwin, with the Second Church, belong to that period, and stood unmoved by the sweeping tide—"Faithful among the faithless only" they, their fidelity was not the product of momentary impulse, of blind stubbornness, nor of superficial thought. The massive oak, that wrestles successfully with the tempest, stands fast because its roots are deep, and of slow growth.

It is too late in the centuries to ask Baptists to dispute with the Master who has categorically declared Himself Divine, or to believe that He was "paltering in a double sense" when He parted the destiny of men into reward and penalty, and deliberately chose the same word, "everlasting," as the measure of each. Heresy trials are not common among Baptists. They have no supreme tribunal, no credal standard, and no temple for them. Their confidence in soul-liberty leads them to trust the self-cleansing power of vital Christianity. Since every man and every church "counts for one, and none counts for more than one," individual eccentricities may for a time occur, but the Baptists as a people must not be confounded with individual persons or churches, who may sometimes be exceedingly individual and not much else.

WANTED: A MARGIN.

From *The Sunday-School Times* (Undenom.), Philadelphia, February, 1892.

In one of Charles Egbert Craddock's stories a lawyer puts the case to a jury: "How many of us keep yaller dogs in our houses, and of what use are they?" The community to which he spoke was composed mainly of poor men; and it has been observed that more dogs, "yaller" and other, are kept among the poor than among the rich. Even those who can hardly "keep body and soul together," and who, in very hard winters, are obliged to ask assistance to tide over the worst weeks, are commonly found to keep a dog. And if it be not a dog, then there will be some other piece of extravagance,—furniture more costly and solid than the need, a musical instrument for which they have little use, or the like. It is a common experience that the poor also have some very expensive tastes. The eleventh ward of New York, which is made up chiefly of tenement-houses, contains some three hundred and fifty liquor saloons, most of which are costly in adornment and gorgeous in their style. One of them has a counter fringed with silver dollars nailed to the woodwork. So in more innocent matters the dealers say that the poor buy the first and dearest instalment of every kind of fruit, the costliest pieces of meat, and the like.

Now, in an economic view, to take no higher, all this is wasteful and foolish,—so much so that one might expect that an appeal to the common sense of the poor would put an end to it all. But it does not. About the most ineffective of all the arguments for temperance is that which urges the costliness of drink. It may be doubted if ever a drunkard was reformed by it; and, if he were, we, by instinct, should doubt the quality of the reformation.

All these extravagances grow out of an instinctive resistance to the idea that man is to be content with the necessary and the indispensable. In truth, we all share, more or less, in this instinct. The very buttons on our coats show that. A penny-wise man once calculated that the superfluous buttons on the coats of professing Christians would pay for the support of a large number of missionaries, if they were cut off and sold for that purpose. The calculation had a wide circulation, but not a button the less was worn, nor a missionary the more sent. Man, indeed, is so constituted that he must have a margin, whether it be "yaller dogs" or superfluous buttons. He despises a life which is tied to what is required for existence—to what he cannot do without. It is said that Diogenes the Cynic tried to reduce life to its lowest terms in this respect. He discarded everything but a rough suit of clothes and a drinking-cup; and when he saw a boy drink out of his hand, he threw the cup away. But Diogenes takes no very high stand in the world's esteem, and most people enjoy Plato's retort on him. He trampled, with his dirty feet, on a rug which Plato possessed as a part of his superfluity, saying, "Thus I trample on the pride of Plato!" "And with greater pride, Diogenes," was the wiser man's answer.

This contempt of the limits of the merely necessary has its correspondent in the moral and spiritual life. We all feel that the minimizing spirit is a mean spirit. The man who is honest up to what the law, or even public opinion, exacts of him, but goes no farther, and cannot be depended upon beyond that, is worthless for the best social purposes. We look for something exuberant, for some overflow in the moral qualities of people whom we respect and love. They must give good measure, pressed down and running over, if they are to come up to our standard. It is on men who have no minimum standard of duty that society is dependent. They make the success of every business house, of every public corporation, of every government. They work for an ideal end in every sphere and on every level of life.

In the spiritual life this is equally true. The minimum Christian, who does just what he must, and has no overflow of spontaneous, unasked service in him, may count in the membership of the Church, but he does not weigh in the emphasis of its life and influence. Our Lord recognized this in his relations to men. He was careful of the spontaneous, to shield it from harsh criticism, to give it every recognition. Mary sitting at his feet, Mary anointing his feet with ointment, the children greeting him with hosannas,—these are the instances which first come to mind. His warnings that the citizens of his kingdom must exceed in their righteousness the strict and scrupulous legality of the Pharisees, points in the same direction. He looks for heartiness, for zeal, for enthusiasm, in his people. He had but one minimum Christian among his disciples,—Judas, who thought the box of precious ointment was too costly an offering, and "who also betrayed him."

"He that will always do all that lawfully he may, will ofttimes do that which lawfully he may not," says an eminent divine. This puts forward the negative side of the same truth. It is a bad indication in us when we begin to ask how far we may go in doubtful things, and yet not cast off our Christian allegiance. There is a certain exuberance in self-denial which befits a Christian. He does not minimize his abstinences. He does not love to drive near the edge of moral and social precipices. He keeps well back from them. He leaves a safe margin there. He feels that the lawful and the expedient have distinctly different boundary lines. If not for his own sake, then for the sake of his brethren, he will hold back from what may put a stumbling-block in their way. He will seek not his own good in the enjoyment, but his neighbor's good in the abstinence.

The safest guide in all this is what the Apostle points to. It is love, a grace which always is exuberant in its manifestations—always has a margin.

THE BEGINNING.

Students of politics tell us that public sentiment is a stronger moral force than law. The latter punishes crime; the former prevents it. We are only beginning to recognize the fact that our law-makers represent the average intelligence and morals of the people who place them in power. There are voters above them and below them in morals and intelligence, but the legislative body, whether of city, State, or Nation, represents the majority. Its acts, individual as well as collective, are the reflex of the community, the Nation; the political mirror in which its nature is revealed.

This great law is true of the family. Its position in the community represents the mental and moral condition of the members, individual and collective. Each member is fairly representative of the public sentiment that governs the home and that prevails in it. The devil does not feel at home with the righteous. He may be a member of the family, and if he is, it is almost certain that the family live a double life, having one code of morals that is aired for the public, but practising another when safe from the public eye. It is this dual life that makes private scoundrels and public criminals. Where the public sentiment of the home is for truth, virtue, cleanliness; where vice or its predecessor, dirt, are strangers, or known as the two things responsible for all evils, there is never a head bowed in shame in that home, or a public treasury depleted to protect the community against a criminal born in it. What we need in our homes is clearer moral perception. Ask the question, What is vice? and the answer will too often be a category of acts that bring legal penalties. We use milder words to express offences that do not demand the attention of public magistrates. When in every home any act that offends against the divine in man meets with a condemnation equal to its moral effect on the nature of the criminal, society will be less frequently shocked at the appearance of depravity in homes that bear the semblance of virtue and godliness. As public sentiment, when used politically, means the pressure of a moral majority for the common good, so in the home it is the united opinion of units working for the God in man.—*Christian Union.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

History of the People of Israel. By Ernest Renan, Author of "Life of Jesus." Vol. I. Till the Time of King David. Vol. II. From the Reign of David up to the Capture of Samaria. Vol. III. From the Time of Hezekiah till the Return from Babylon. Boston: Roberts Bros., 1889–91. 8vo, pp. xxviii., 362; xi., 455; ix., 429, $2 each.

First, a few words with reference to the translation itself. The translator's name is withheld; and well, for the work is very poorly done; it is inferior even to the hack work with which we have of late years become familiar. The translator knows English very imperfectly. If he is a foreigner, he may be pardoned for not using our idioms with ease, but no one can be pardoned such gross ignorance of the commonest principles of English if he is to attempt to write it for the public. Orthography, inflection, syntax, order of words and of clauses—he sins against them all.

He seems not to know Hebrew at all; not even enough to copy a word correctly. The most egregious errors have escaped detection. It would perhaps be too great censure to say that he does not know the French language. It may be that he does; but one thing is certain: he often had very dim ideas, and at times none at all, as to the French that Renan wrote. Very careless work was done by the proof-readers also; in the use of capitals, punctuation, and the like there is no manner of uniformity. We give a few of the illustrations that have come to our notice.

"It will be then that a disinterested history of these two great creeds will be of value, for the period when impartial studies upon the past of humanity will have arrived and may not last very long." "Connexity" is a common word with him, and "Hebraic" for "Hebrew" as an adjective. "The only primitive measure ("punitive"? French "coercitive") known were death or expulsion from the tribe." "Dinah was not done violence to; she was merely eloped with." "Pasteurs" is almost always translated by "pastors;" as, for example, "The semite pastors as it seem were much struck by this." "Man was for thousands of years crazy (un fou) after having been for thousands of years an animal." "The *refaïm*, the vain shadows of the dead which are buried in the earth (demeurrent sous terre)." "The number six was the basis of Babylonian numeration, so that 6×1 (French, $6 + 1$) represented very much what 12×1 ($12 + 1$) does to us. The seventh was something supererogatory and unclassed like the thirteenth with us." "Laban, the father of the pastors, who spoke Aramaic, etc. . . . Galeed is the limit of Aramean and Hebrew." Elsewhere we find "Galaad." "This lofty ideal of the nomad life remains a sort of magnetic needle (French, pôle) towards which Israel will constantly gravitate." "The pig was at first (tout d'abord) placed among the meat to be avoided." "Evil entailed punishment even when the law was transgressed unwillingly (involuntarily)." "The voyage of Israel through the desert." "A profound knowledge in the art of cursing (jeter les sorts)." Now we read of the "Manassite family," and now of the "Manassehite."

One chapter is entitled "The Conquest of the Region Beyond (en deça du) Jordan." "Terror" is the best translation he can give of "stupeur," though in using it he misses the mark entirely. "These figurative (figurées) images of Iahveh were called Ephods." Perhaps it cannot be denied that David raised a band of "idle scamps," but the expression strikes one as a little odd. "A royalty of this description founded on (selon) all the rules of history, on (sur) heroism." "One more superstitious than him." "If thou shalt (wilt) take that, take it." Renan chances to use the word *Chorège;* the translator adds this foot-note of explanation: "The *Chorège* among the Greeks was the person who found money for spectacles"—a definition perfectly intelligible to any one who knows the meaning of *Chorège.* "Voice of kinsmanship." "These notes of an epoch which never reached its zenith" should be—who would suspect it?—"These notes of an Epic which was never elaborated." "This appreciation of so finished a soldier" being interpreted means, a veteran emeritus. "David's descendants occupied the throne without any known solution of continuity." Repeatedly we read of the "Executioner" of the Divine decree and the like. "The columns before the temple were hollow, but the metal was four cubits (doights) in thickness." "The burning of incense was a rite which could scarcely develop itself in a close sanctuary;" Renan says plainly that it could scarcely develop anywhere else. "Crisîm (Couschites)" is a choice bit. The translator makes the siege of Samaria last eleven years, over against Renan's three. "Del Proph. Jessara" is supposed to be the German title of Dillmann's Commentary on Isaiah. "Justice is intermittent; Iahveh varies from day to day (a ses jours)." We have "Messiahism" and "Messiahnism." "There are at the beginning of this Psalm certain superfetations due to errors of the copyists." "A style coldly patriotic and starchly official." "Close of the eighth and beginning of the seventh centuries B.C." is changed to "close of the eighth and beginning of the ninth." He struggles with the name of the ninth minor prophet; he cannot decide between Sophonius and Zephaniah. In vol. iii., p. 121, he translates a foot-note directly, "With regards to *Bnê hammelek*, see above, p. 45, n. 2," without noticing that the English pagination differs from the French, or that he has *omitted* the foot-note given on p. 45 of the French, or that he does not use numbers to designate his foot-notes. "In the third year of Josiah, the king being only twenty." Achæmenes and the dynasty named after him prove troublesome. We find "the sons of Achæmenidæ" and the "Achæmenidian empire" mentioned. A certain Hebrew quotation is given in the French edition, ten words on one line, the remaining three words of course at the beginning of the next line. In the English, there being space in the first line for another word, we find word No. 13 at the right of word No. 1, as would be quite natural if the responsible person did not know which way Hebrew reads. In another, out of eight Hebrew letters, four are wrong.

The translator, however, has not spoiled the work; sometimes in spite of him, and often by his aid, the author's marvellous style and poetic imagination charm the reader. The work is a history of Old Testament literature, an Old Testament theology, and a history of Israel combined.

Renan regards J as the earliest document of the Pentateuch, composed in the Northern Kingdom. It is itself a compilation based and modelled upon the Book of Legends, as regards patriarchal times. This Book of Legends he exalts with the highest praises: its record of creation is grand, poetic, charming. "It is a boundless ocean, to be ship-wrecked upon which is a pleasure." A second book used by the compiler of J was the Book of the Wars of Jahveh, or the Book of Jasher, composed of ancient canticles; "in my opinion it was the origin of the Book of Judges, and furnished the finest elements of the books called after Samuel." The author also introduced a "Book of the Alliance." "There is no doubt that the writer (J) . . . in undertaking the compilation of his sacred history, had as his chief object the insertion in the sacred records of a code which would be an abridged summary of the precepts of Jahveh."

A second account existed in Jerusalem, the Elohist (825–800 B.C.). The author had access to documentary sources for certain parts—*e.g.*, for Gen. x., for the history of Edom, for genealogical tables, and the like. The Decalogue was to this what the Book of the Covenant was to J. The chief object of the Elohist version was the enumeration of genealogies. The fusion of the two documents occurred probably in Hezekiah's time; for the work of uniting them, the sources of J were still available and used.

D dates from Josiah's time—*i.e.*, "a fresh text" was composed "in which the ancient precepts would be incorporated, in a manner more suited to the ideas of the times." "The substance of nearly all the sacerdotal and Levitical portions of the Torah appears to date from the period twenty or twenty-five years after the transportation;" the form was afterward altered several times. "Lev. xviii.–xxvi., it is wiser to believe, was composed from the writings of Ezekiel by one of his disciples."

The author, as his creed requires of him, lays special stress upon the development of Hebrew theology in Old Testament times. The interest in the work rests, of course, upon his unusual theological position. Such as he do not commonly give much time to the study of the Bible, except to ridicule it. Renan's treatment of the subject, on the contrary, is perfectly sober and respectful; he says Jonah "is the only book of the Hebrew literature upon which one may be led to joke a little." Even here his joking is very mild, and he is quite in sympathy with the writer's purpose, and pleased with the way he carries it out. Not all of his readers will be satisfied with his cheap attribution of so much to fanaticism, or, on the other hand, his failure to make any explanation of the unique course of Hebrew theology among the theologies of the nations. However, the history is not written in a spirit antagonistic to the Bible; certainly not if we let Renan judge; not, even if we are content to let the book speak for itself and bring its own message. The Bible will never suffer from a serious honest examination, even though the investigator's point of view be peculiar. Theologians lose nothing by comparing views with others, especially with those strong in their convictions, and able to express themselves, as is Renan, clearly and forcibly.

We have in this history a curious phenomenon; the author requires 362 pages to narrate his history down to the time of the establishment of David as king over all Israel. He continues the narrative down to the capture of Samaria in 455 pages, and finds 429 enough to bring the history down to the return from the Captivity. And this in spite of the fact that he reserves for his second and third volumes all consideration of the documents upon which he relies for his information. The sources available for constructing a history of the first period do not warrant the expenditure upon it of so much space relatively. Renan's attitude toward literary criticism is by no means conservative. He does not scruple ever and anon through the work to reject a story because the narrative is untrustworthy; he does not hesitate to adopt changes in the text which secure a more agreeable reading for him. He does not feel forced to accept a statement because to throw it out would impeach the honesty of the writer. He is a radical so far as he is a critic, and is by no means to be cited as proof that an unprejudiced mind will see history in the Hexateuchal narratives. Renan's justification of his first volume is given in the preface. He confesses that it will be displeasing to the "narrow-minded persons" who have the "French defect of not allowing that it is possible to write the history of times concerning which one has not a series of material facts to relate." "There are no facts of this kind in the history of Israel up to the time of David." And yet he says that the legends which we have can be used as sources for history—what history? Here he becomes confused. Now it is history of the times to which the legends refer, and now, history of the times in which they were written. Now he seems to insist that it is the very legendary parts themselves from which the truth can be culled by inference, then he speaks of rejecting entirely all that is legendary, and using what of truth remains, as foundation of history. There is in all this not so much a conservative spirit as an uncritical one. There is too much poetry in Renan for a modern critical historian. In a sentence which he would perhaps not have construed too literally, he disarms all criticism of his first volume thus: "Every phrase should be accompanied by a *perhaps;* I believe that I have used it pretty freely, but if the reader does not think that it occurs often enough, he can fill it in at his own discretion. If he does this, he will arrive at exactly what I think."

Apropos of Renan's remark that the future of Hebrew philology lies along the line of textual criticism, one is tempted to feel that it is unfortunate that the literary criticism cart has been thus far arranged before the textual criticism horse. It requires more skill than is possessed by a large proportion of critics to trace a straight track under such abnormal circumstances. The wonder is that they have accomplished so much.

The author has in mind and is reported to be engaged upon a fourth volume, which will connect this work with his "Life of Jesus," and other works upon New Testament history. It is to be hoped that the translation will be of better quality.

OWEN H. GATES.
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER. Two volumes. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891. 12mo, pp. xx., 238; 351.

One greets a book with this title eagerly, hoping to find it a contribution to a science that is far from the end of its development, or if not that, at least a handbook presenting in convenient form, for the use of students of theology, the latest and best results of scholarship in this department. The volumes before us disappoint such a hope, and one is interested, it must be said, more in the problem in literary ethics which they present than in any solution to the problems of New Testament theology which they offer.

The work proves upon examination to be based upon, or more correctly, culled from the well-known works of Weiss, Schmid, Neander, Lechler

("Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times"), and Gebhardt ("Doctrine of the Apocalypse"). Weiss is generally adhered to, but the author regards Weiss as too liberal a critic, and this leads not to any free criticism and modification of Weiss's views in detail, but to certain changes in the order of arrangement and to the introduction of sections from the other writers named supplementing or displacing those of Weiss. Our author's use of his sources consists not in a reproduction of their thought in summary, but in a selection of sentences incorporated with practically literal fidelity. Altogether the larger part of the book consists in a series of quotations. A presentation of Weiss's views in readable and attractive form, based on a thorough working over of his material, would be a labor not easy, but quite worthy of being done; but in a mere series of disconnected quotations, the difficulty and heaviness of Weiss's style is retained, while thoroughness of discussion, his chief merit, is sacrificed. The question of the possible usefulness of such work as this need not, however, be answered too emphatically in the negative. There is much good material in the book; of this the names of its real authors are a sufficient guarantee. But the interesting problem already suggested is forced upon us by the preface, where we read: "The writer has simply sought to reproduce the thoughts of the sacred writers, taking the statements of Scripture as the basis. . . . He has sought with all the power and gifts that God has bestowed upon him, guided by His Spirit, clearly and simply to set forth the true meaning of God's Word. . . . The writer simply presents what he believes to be the plain, simple teaching of Scripture; and what has been written he holds to be the truth of God's Word, as he now understands it. The first writing of this work was finished two years ago; but so important is the subject, that the writer felt it his duty to study anew the whole New Testament, in an inductive way, and to develop again the teaching of each book separately. . . . Special attention also was given to all the most important treatises relating to the entire subject published in English, German and Swedish during the last decades. On the basis of these preliminary studies the whole work has been entirely rewritten during the last year, and some parts even three times." How did it happen that, after such minute and long-continued study of the text, and in the course of these several rewritings, the writer chanced so very infrequently upon the slightest originality even of language? The actual character of the book is not at all disclosed by such acknowledgment as the preface contains of the author's indebtedness to Weiss and the others.

The problem is not made easier by the list of authorities (pp. xi.–xiv.). Here are presented "some of the books and editions which have been constantly used and referred to in the preparation of this work." Here, beside the four or five books from which our volumes are almost exclusively compiled, there are the titles of some two hundred others, of the use of which one does not know where to look for a trace. As a list of authorities on New Testament theology, it is curiously inadequate.

The question presented by the book is, as before remarked, one of literary ethics. No one would think of accusing the author of intentional dishonesty, and perhaps if one will write text-books on all branches of theology it must be done in some such way as this; but it is surely fair that the title-page, and either quotation marks or explicit statements in the preface should make the character and sources of the book perfectly manifest. It should be added that in the matter of eschatology the author seems to go a way of his own. The character of the discussion is not, however, such as to lead us seriously to regret the course ordinarily pursued.

To the student of the biblical theology of the New Testament our advice would be, Buy and study Weiss or Schmid, Neander or Lechler, all of which are accessible in English, and any one of which is of very far greater value than the work here reviewed. FRANK C. PORTER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

BURIED CITIES AND BIBLE COUNTRIES. By GEORGE ST. CLAIR, F.G S., Member of the Society of Biblical Archæology, and ten years lecturer for the Palestine Exploration Fund. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1891. 8vo, pp. 378, $2.

THE BIBLE AND MODERN DISCOVERIES. With Map and Illustrations. By HENRY A. HARPER, Member of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Fourth Edition, with Notes, Errata, and Appendix. London: Printed for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Alexander P. Watt; New York: Macmillan, 1891. 8vo, pp. xix., 418, *7s. 6d.*

STEININSCHRIFT UND BIBELWORT. Von HEINRICH BRUGSCH. Berlin: Allgemeiner Verein für Deutsche Litterature (Hermann Paetel), 1891. 8vo, pp. iv, 344, 6 marks.

It is absolutely certain that we should not have had the first two of these volumes if it had not been for the existence of and excavations made by or under the auspices of those two noble societies, the Egypt and the Palestine Exploration Funds. The amount of our indebtedness to them would be hard to estimate. The activity and resolute intelligence of their agents are for the most part beyond all question and praise. The labors of neither are at an end, and the field for operations seems almost utterly inexhaustible. In fact, the Egypt Fund seems only to have just begun its labors, though it is well nigh a decade since its organization. Its efforts in its latest undertaking, a careful survey of the land of the Nile and its monuments, is worthy of the aid of all who have an interest in those discoveries which tend to the extension of our knowledge of ancient history, especially in connection with the biblical narrative.

These books all differ in scope and contents, though in parts they cover the same ground. The first is probably better than the second for the use of the Bible student intent on a knowledge of topography. The second follows the biblical narrative more closely down to 2 Chronicles. The third relates entirely to Egypt, illustrating its connection with the Bible The first two cover Egypt and Palestine, while the first contains some reference to Mesopotamia as well. Each in its way is an excellent work, wrought out with considerable care and calculated to be of assistance to all who seek for such information as they contain. They have, however, been placed in what may justly be considered as the order of their worth and importance. Each writer is competent for his task, but from the standpoint of their value to the reader they must be thus assigned.

Somehow we do not expect to find an index in a German work of this character, and in this matter Dr. Brugsch has not disappointed us. The redeeming feature in this regard is that the arrangement of the book is such that we may tell approximately where a given topic will be discussed, by reference to the "contents." The same is true only in part of the volume by Mr. St. Clair. It lacks an index, and in default of it most of its treasures will have to be hunted for in order to be made available. It is simply abominable that a book like this, crowded with Scripture references, names of places, men, and identifications, should be put forth without an index. It is a shortsighted economy which amounts to niggardliness. Mr. Harper's volume contains ten pages of index, and is fairly satisfactory in this respect, though it is not perfect. The maps given are all clear and distinct, though it is to be noted that those in Mr. St. Clair's book do not entirely agree with one another.

In works which contain so vast an amount of detail as these, it is not to be expected that every statement can stand the test of careful criticism and examination, though for the credit of the authors it is to be said that they have used a vast amount of material in their labors.

In the treatment of his subject Mr. St. Clair holds himself down, as far as possible, to statements of facts or of the opinions of the most competent judges of matters discussed. Most of the book is solid reading without extraneous moralizings. But Mr. Harper has seen fit to grace his pages with occasional suggested religious reflections which in their places might be sufficiently edifying, but which are decidedly out of place in a book which aims to give a popular account of modern discoveries by means of exploration and excavation.

Dr. Brugsch has given us a little book which he seems to have put together out of his vast stores of Egyptian lore without much labor or serious effort. That the book is as small as it is is due rather to his self restraint than to the exhaustion of the materials which we might have expected *him* to marshal, but that the book is satisfactory in all respects is not true. Perhaps it is too much to expect Dr. Brugsch to be very enthusiastic in the presentation of the facts which disprove the Exodus theory, which has been called by his name on account of his earnest advocacy of it, though, in fact, the theory is over a century old. His disregard of historical sequence was exhibited in his *Mythologie der alten Ægypter* and is seen here. It is a pity that men of great reputation should be willing to give such cheap illustrations of their readiness to rest upon laurels already gained, and to produce works of doubtful worth or of misleading character.

Dr. Brugsch gives no list of books nor references by which one may "control" his statements. Mr. Harper is quite conscientious in both, and Mr. St. Clair gives his authorities at the end of each section, though unfortunately he omits volume and page.

In closing, reference may be made to a fashion which is becoming common in such books as these. So far as we have seen, Dr. Trumbull has most thoroughly exploited the matter and carried it to the utmost extreme. This fashion is to infer from the Hebrew designation of the desert east of the Nile Delta, *Shur*, that it derived its name from a "wall" which extended in granite solidity across the isthmus and prevented both ingress and departure. But the existence of anything more than two or three castles or "walled" forts remains to be proved. A parallel case is seen in the views regarding Succoth (Hebrew, "tents"), which was long held to be merely a camping place impossible of identification, whereas we now know that it was the name of a city and a district.

Again, Etham was certainly not Edom, and to identify it with Qetam or Khetam, "fortress" (even supposing that these were actually the Egyptian vowels in the word), requires the dropping of a harsh guttural which would have to be well supported before it could be accepted.

Finally, the latest and most scientific opinion is coming to agree with the statements of Strabo and other ancient geographers, which imply a very considerable extension of the Red Sea to the north of its present limits. The bearing of this upon the question of the Exodus route and the place of crossing is extremely important, and it is quite within the range of possibility that henceforth we shall hear very little of the Suez theory, and of the stupendous miracle involved in it, and of the superhuman march of Moses' hosts of men, women, children, and cattle half way across the Isthmus of Suez within the narrow limits allowed by the itinerary of Exodus. CHARLES R. GILLETT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

A STUDY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY. By ELLEN M. MITCHELL. With an Introduction by W. R. Alger. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 1891. Pp. xxviii., 282, $1.25.

Perhaps the chief interest of this "Study" is the fact that it is the outcome of lectures delivered by a woman to women in the Western cities of St. Louis and Denver. As such it deserves cordial recognition. It is clearly the result of much reading and of such sympathetic appreciation of the problems of philosophy as few women care even to cultivate, and only one at rare intervals can claim to possess. That it should bear traces of its origin is not unnatural. No one but a woman, probably, would describe Plato's account of Socrates as a "living portrait set in a frame of ideal beauty," or tell us to regard Aristotle's achievements "with awe," or note so minutely the presence of *two* women in the Academy, and the indebtedness of Socrates to a woman, Diatima, as a historical fact. The lectures, enlivened by anecdote, and reproducing in fairly good order the opinions of the Greek sages as interpreted by some of the best modern historians, must have been instructive and stimulating to their auditors, and are well fitted, in their more permanent form, to be of like service to a similar class of readers.

At the same time, the unaided reader will be a good deal puzzled by those "clear and decisive" judgments of Hegel, to which the author appeals so admiringly. The bare statement, for instance, that Plato's idea "lacks the principle of vital subjectivity as the moment of actuality," whereas Aristotle's absolute is "Energy, whose nature it is to dirempt or duplicate this being-for-itself," can convey but scant meaning to the uninitiated; while the assertion in the immediate context that "Aristotle develops the principle of negativity, or individualization, as distinction or difference, not in the sense of a contingent and merely special subjectivity, but of the pure subjectivity," will strike even the trained student with a deeper doubt than relates to the propriety of the language. Yet propositions like these are scattered freely through the book, as though they were the merest matter-of-course.

This subserviency to Hegel is symptomatic. Mrs. Mitchell is an intelligent pupil, but she has not yet learned to vindicate fully her own independence. She has studied text-books more than texts, and follows the footsteps of her teachers. The consequence is that her book, commendable as it is in many respects, contains nothing that is original; in some cases, particularly under Hegel's fatuous influence, it fails to represent the best modern judgment—in the treatment of Heraclitus, for example. A single monograph, worked out from the sources, would have been far more valuable both in itself and as evidence, in which the writer of this review has a special reason to be interested, of the ability of women to do successful work in this department. H. N. Gardiner.

Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Brief Reviews, by the Editor.

Truman Marcellus Post, D.D.: A Biography, Personal and Literary, by *T. A. Post.* (Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1891, 8vo, pp. xv., 507.) This volume deserves a far larger space than it is possible here to give it. It is not often that the life of a minister touches so many points of general interest as did that of Dr. Post. The story of the boy, of the college student, of the professor, of the preacher, and of the patriot is full of sustained interest and instruction. After several years spent as a member of the "First Faculty" of Illinois College at Jacksonville, he added to his duties those of pastor of the Congregational Church at the same place. Here his anti-slavery principles became fixed, and they were intensified by the Alton riots; but in spite of the renewed avowal of them, he was called to the pastorate of the Third Presbyterian Church of St. Louis, where he completed twenty-five years of active service. Here he was one of the pillars of clerical loyalty in the trying days of 1861–64. Here also he became the pioneer of Congregationalism in the West, defending its principles and its very right to exist. His fame spread throughout the land, and demands were made for his services by the largest bodies in his denomination on many occasions. The whole story is one of great interest from start to finish. The biographer has performed his task admirably, and has so interwoven the record of the life with the productions of mind and pen that we have a very complete and perfect portrait of the father. The extracts from various writings of Dr. Post show a man on fire with his subjects, and giving utterance to his thoughts with a wealth of diction and a variety of imagery not often equalled. One of the most interesting portions of the book deals with the assumption of the duties of the pastoral office. Especially valuable is the account of Dr. Post's connection with the introduction of Congregationalism into St. Louis, where he stood, as he himself said, as an "out-Post" of the denomination.

The Church of England in Nova Scotia and the Tory Clergy of the Revolution, by *Arthur Wentworth Eaton*, B.A., Presbyter of the Diocese of New York. (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1891, 8vo, pp. xiv., 320, $1.50 net.) This volume possesses a double interest and value, in that it relates the history of the Church founded by the Loyalists, who were compelled to leave Massachusetts and New York at the era of the Revolution, and because it is the only history of that Church now easily available. It is the result of much research, is drawn from the best sources attainable, and is written in a plain, unostentatious style which is as clear glass, showing the object to be seen, but reflecting no image of the narrator. The biographical sketches of the Tory clergymen of the period are quite full and valuable. It is to be regretted that the author was unable to execute his first design of writing more in detail and giving the various parish histories, as well as that of the Church in general. The volume is to be welcomed as an addition to the literature of American Church history, filling, in fact, one of the "long-felt wants."

The Races of the Old Testament (By-Paths of Bible Knowledge, XVI.), by *A. H. Sayce*, LL.D. (London: Religious Tract Society; New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891, 12mo, pp. 180, $1.20.) The name of Dr. Sayce is well known to all students of biblical antiquities. He needs no introduction. In this little book we are presented with some of the most recent results of exploration and study. Among these may be mentioned some specimens of the valuable series of portraits of prisoners of various nationalities, as the same were sculptured by Egyptian artists, reproduced by Mr. Petrie, the veteran explorer. Dr. Sayce writes enthusiastically and in pleasing fashion. Some things, however, are scarcely as certain as would appear from the tone and confidence of the writer. We think also that he underestimates the intelligence and interest of his readers when he apologizes for the introduction of occasional foot-notes. More would have been better than so few. To the Bible student the volume will be of interest and profit.

The Life and Times of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore (By-Paths of Bible Knowledge, XVII.), by Rev. *H. G. Tomkins*, late Vicar of Branscombe. (London: Religious Tract Society; New York and Chicago: Revell, sole agent, 1891, 12mo, pp. 192, $1.) The author of this work is already favorably known through his "Studies on the Times of Abraham." He has here presented the results of a very extensive and exhaustive course of reading upon the setting of the life of Joseph, both before his Egyptian career and during the same, and he has followed the matter down to the time of the "new" Pharaoh, who began to oppress the growing Israel. The presentation contains very few of the extravagant conjectures of those who expect to find an Egyptian chronicle parallel with that of Genesis and Exodus. There are some minor points in it to which we might take exception, but in the main it is to be heartily commended as an excellent *résumé* of the subject. The author does not expect impossibilities, and in this he may disappoint some who look at Egyptian history solely through biblical eyes. An excellent index is appended.

The New York Obelisk: Cleopatra's Needle, with a preliminary sketch of the history, erection, uses, and signification of obelisks, by *Charles E. Moldenke*, A.M., Ph.D. (New York: Randolph & Co., 1891, 8vo, pp. viii., 202, $2.) The ground covered by this volume is considerable, and a part of the covering is pretty thin. It has an appearance of considerable erudition, but the amount of actual learning necessary to produce the book is not as great as might be supposed. The author has brought together a considerable amount of information, but it is not well digested, and it is presented in language which is sometimes far from being a model of good English. The reproduction of the hieroglyphic writing is generally correct, though we have noted one error repeated a number of times, and a second which can only be explained on the ground of ignorance. The translations are scarcely to be accepted as models nor as perfect specimens of their class. The reader of the volume will, however, learn what a dreary waste these inscriptions are, so far as coherence and common sense are concerned. The author gives no idea, however, that they are equally a jumble and an unsolved riddle in their grammatical forms and syntax as well.

The Oldest Drama in the World: the Book of Job, arranged in dramatic form, with elucidations, by Rev. *Alfred Walls.* With a prefatory note by Henry A. Buttz, D.D., LL.D., President of Drew Theological Seminary. (New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891, 16mo, pp. 124, 60 cents.) While it is a commonplace to say that the Book of Job is dramatic in nature, the author's claim to be the first to have put it in dramatic *form* may possibly be true. This has been accomplished by the use of the Revised Version, with the substitution of the forms preferred by the American Revisers. The introductory words, like, "Then Job answered and said," are relegated to foot-notes, their place being supplied by the indication of the appropriate *dramatis personæ* in the margin. It may be seriously doubted whether the author has made any substantial addition to our appreciation of this grandest of ancient writings. His introduction is certainly not a piece of strong writing, and in places it is decidedly sophomoric in tone. The bibliography is anything but complete, even in English, though it is fairly good.

A Practical Introductory Hebrew Grammar, by *Edwin Cone Bissell*, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary. (Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Theological Seminary, 1891, 8vo, pp. ix., 134, $1.75.) It has never been our lot to find any teacher of Hebrew who thoroughly liked or agreed with the grammar which he used in the class-room—unless he was its author. The present book is not likely to be an exception to the rule. So far as the printing is concerned, nothing need be clearer. The method has this to commend it, that it is an embodiment of what has been found to meet the needs of the author in actual work. Its chief characteristics are "compactness of form" and "facilities for acquiring . . . a choice Hebrew vocabulary." In this latter an extensive system of mnemonics has been employed, possibly more useful than appears on the surface. In view of the general attitude of Hebrew instructors to Hebrew grammars, we may be excused if we refrain from an expression of opinion; merely calling attention to the publication and allowing each to form his own estimate from personal examination.

Sermons by Howard Crosby. (New York: Randolph, 1891, 12mo, pp. 247, $1.25.) It is seldom that the death of a minister touches so many classes of men and such a variety of interests as did that of Dr. Crosby. Not only the Church and denomination with which he was connected, but also his city and State mourned his loss. His departure left a blank impossible to fill. Whether one agreed with him or not, it was impossible not to admire his courage, his depth of conviction, and his earnestness in pursuing those courses which he conscientiously regarded as right. We are glad to have this little volume of twenty sermons as a slight memorial. Best of all, they are reproduced exactly as he wrote them, without "revision," note, or comment. They bear no marks of the seemingly mechanical method of their preparation. Given twenty-four pages of manuscript to be prepared in six days, the daily quota was four pages. This, we have heard him assert, was his uniform practice; an example extremely difficult and even hazardous to follow. To write a whole sermon at one sitting was a very rare occurrence.

Ruth the Gleaner, and Esther the Queen, by *William M. Taylor*, D.D., LL D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York. (New York: Harper, 1891, 12mo, pp. vi., 269, $1.50.) This is the latest addition to the author's series of biographies of biblical characters, prepared primarily for lectures to his people. Its character, aim, method, and style are similar to those which the previous volumes have exhibited. The delineation of character and the exposition of incidents are those of a master, and they who have had the pleasure of reading the previous volumes will need no special commendation of this one. The book will prove of interest and advantage to all classes of readers; especially to students who are preparing themselves for usefulness in similar ways, and for ministers who desire to make themselves more widely influential for good.

Happiness in the Spiritual Life; or, The Secret of the Lord, a Series of Practical Considerations, by the Rev. *William Clavell Ingham*, M.A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral and Vicar of St. Matthew's, Leicester. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891, 8vo, pp. viii., 347, $2.25.) The volume before us contains, in a revised form and slightly changed, a series of addresses delivered in Liverpool during the Lenten seasons from 1887 to 1891 at special mid-day services. They are models in the way of cumulative presentation, and the thought grows in fulness and power as page follows page. Happiness is defined as "the satisfaction experienced by the sentient being in the possession and in the exercise of perfectly healthful life." The divisions of the book are "Happiness in the Spiritual Life," "Helps and Hindrances," "Resolutions," "Responsibilities," and "A Scriptural Example of the Spiritual Life." In every way the volume is a pleasure to the reader, and it is freighted with lessons of deep interest and high import.

Gospel Singers and their Songs, by *F. D. Hemenway*, D.D., and *Charles M. Stuart*, B.D. (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891, 12mo, pp. 195, 80 cents.) It is impossible to crowd into so few pages an account of the hymnology of the Christian Church in all its history. Nevertheless, the authors have presented an extensive array of facts in this little book, which gives a general idea of the subject. As a groundwork or introduction the volume has its value, but there is comparatively little which gives the "environment" of the hymns, their occasion, and their history. These are the things which the ordinary reader wants to know. The incidents which are given are of interest and to be numbered among the best.

A Winter in India and Malaysia among the Methodist Missions, by Rev. *M. V. B. Knox*, Ph.D., D.D. With an Introduction by Bishop John F. Hurst, D.D., LL.D. (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891, 12mo, pp. 306, $1.20.) The author desired to know the mission-fields of his Church in order that he might the more effectively present the cause of missions at home. While on the ground he wrote a series of letters, which were published in various papers. These letters are now gathered in permanent form, in the hope that they may be of service to other pastors who have not enjoyed similar privileges. As Bishop Hurst says, the book has "sprung out of the very experience and needs of the pastor at home." While of special value within the bounds of the author's denomination, the numerous facts and scenes set forth are such as to interest and instruct a far wider range of readers. The circumstances of composition add to the vivacity of the representation, though they gave a sketchy character to the book as a whole.

The Lord's Prayer, being the last Eight Discourses of *James Freeman Clark.* (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1891, 12mo, pp. 95.)

Thy Kingdom Come: Ten Sermons on the Lord's Prayer, preached in King's Chapel, Boston, by *Henry Wilder Foote.* (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1891, 12mo, pp. 232, $1.) In the contemplation of these words of the Master, in which He taught His disciples the practical side and the pre-eminent features of prayer, denominational lines fade away. In them the unity of the whole Church is plainly seen. It will be difficult to find any thoughts or expressions in these books which may not be accepted and adopted by Christians of any name as their own. The discourses are plain, practical, and useful, full of suggestion and helpfulness.

Spiritual Vision, by *Thomas M. Clark*, D.D. (New York: Randolph, 1891, 12mo, pp. 24.) A sound, helpful, and edifying sermon on Luke xxiv. 40, by the Bishop of Rhode Island. It has for its thesis the truth which proved of such value to the author of "The Great Discourse" (see January number of this magazine), that spiritual truth is to be spiritually discerned (1 Cor. ii. 14).

Denominationalism vs. *Christian Union*, by Rev. *Teunis S. Hamlin*, Pastor of the Church of the Covenant, Washington, D. C. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1891, 12mo, pp. 110.) The evils of the excessive number of denominational lines and sectarian fences in America are here stated in plain terms, while the basis for a better understanding and condition is indicated as definitely as present apprehension goes. The signs of advance are sketched by a sympathetic hand. It is indicative of its general character and tone that the Christian Endeavor Societies have taken the volume in hand and are pushing it. By an unfortunate mistake the author's name is made to take a sportive shape on the title-page, where we find it given as *Tennis.*

From the Presbyterian Board of Publication (Philadelphia) have come the following: *Papers for the People, The Credulity of Incredulity*, by *Arthur T. Pierson*, D.D.; and *Conformity to the World*, by *Howard Crosby*, D.D., LL.D. (pp. 31), both excellent; *Bible Light on Mission Paths; or. Topical Scripture Studies*, prepared for use in missionary meetings of women and young people and in monthly concerts (pp. 192), which is just what the name indicates, and may be found useful; *The Bible-Teacher's Guide; or, Methods of Work in Sabbath-School*, prepared by *James A. Worden*, D.D. (pp. 144). The ability of the author to fully meet the task set in this little volume is widely acknowledged, and he has succeeded in making a book thoroughly adapted to its purpose. Its careful study is calculated to improve the methods and develop the ability and tact of the teacher.

A Cyclopædia of Nature Teachings, being a Selection of Facts, Observations, Suggestions, Illustrations, Examples, and Illustrative Hints Taken from all Departments of Inanimate Nature. With an Introduction by Hugh Macmillan, LL.D., F.R.S.E. (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1892, 8vo, pp. xvi., 552, $2.50.) The title of this volume indicates fully its contents. The list of authors quoted is quite large, and the citations are generally pertinent and suggestive, being grouped in relation to "Things above the Earth," "On the Earth," "Under the Earth," "Around the Earth," followed by "Short Sentences on Nature topics." The whole is indexed triply as to subjects, topics, and texts. The value of the book, of course, depends upon the value of selections—a thing upon which it is impossible to express a sweeping opinion. All books like the present contain good grain and chaff, and this is no exception to others of the class.

The Story of Sodom, a Biblical Episode, by *W. C. Kitchin.* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891, 12mo, pp. 285, $1.50.) A story laid in the time of Abraham and Lot, in which the names of other biblical characters are interwoven. The story contains several dramatic scenes, is told very well, and does not lack a considerable degree of local color. It will be read, however, for the story, not for the light which it throws on the biblical narrative.

Ward, Lock & Co. (New York) have published a paper read before the Ruri-Decanal Chapter of St. Margaret's and St. John's, Westminster, in the Jerusalem Chamber, on July 17th, 1890, by the Rev. *G. P. Merrick*, Chaplain of Millbank Prison, London, on *Work among the Fallen as Seen in the Prison Cell.* (1891, pp. 62, 12mo, 40 cents.) The introduction by Archdeacon Farrar calls attention to some of the more salient points in the address. The larger part of the paper is taken up with statistics which are instructive and in some cases startling. The whole book is one that is well worth the attention of those who are engaged in the special work portrayed, and also of all philanthropists who desire to know what is taught by an experience, the equal of which it would be hard to find on the face of the earth. The suggestions of methods and means of reforms are very inclusive, though simple; nevertheless they do not pretend to be exhaustive.

Hereafter we shall not feel obliged to review all of the books which are sent to us, but shall select such for notice as appear to be of special importance in themselves or of general interest to our readers. A list of all books received will, however, appear at the end of this department of the magazine, by way of acknowledgment.

QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

The Andover Review, Boston, Feb., 1892.

In "Ethnic Religion in its Relations to Christianity," Professor Eml. V. Gerhart, Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., shows that however widely the philosophy and poetry of paganism differ from Bible teaching, they nevertheless both move on the same spiritual plane of human life, and both evince that mysterious bond between God and man which makes the natural religious life of mankind the positive basis of the Kingdom of God and the ethnic religions a preparation for the Gospel an unconscious prophecy of Christianity. As "Our Ethical Resources," President William DeWitt Hyde, Brunswick, Me., points out the constraint of discipline, the encouragement of personal sympathy, the moulding influence of institutions, the attraction of literary and æsthetic ideals, the insight of philosophy, and the reverence of religion; but there is in this little, simple, spirited essay so much of perfect discipline and living sympathy, so much insight and so much reverence that it becomes itself a moral support to the reader. "The Duty of Scientific Theology to the Church of To-Day" is a translation of a popular lecture, by Professor Otto Fleiderer, Berlin, Germany. As it gives a survey of the religious development of Protestantism since the Reformation, in order to show that scientific theology has a right to be and an office to fill in the Church just now, it forms an argument in the debate now going on here between the Church and the higher criticism. In a similar way, "Life in Himself," by Professor William Jewett Tucker, Andover, chimes in with the specifical christological researches which have recently been started here on occasion of the radicalism of modern Biblical criticism. "Rembrandt as Educator," by H. C. Bierwith, Ph.D., Andover, is a review of a German book, *Rembrandt als Erzieher*, which appeared anonymously in 1890 and is now in its fortieth edition.

Bibliotheca Sacra (quarterly), Oberlin, O., Jan., 1892.

The opening article, "Authenticity and Inspiration of the Scriptures," by Rev. James H. Fairchild, D.D., ex-President of Oberlin College, forms two chapters of a forthcoming volume on Systematic Theology by the author, but reads perfectly well as an independent essay. "Socialism in its Bearings on Capital, Labor, and Poverty," by Rev. James Macgregor, D.D., Oamaru, New Zealand, views certain points of the received economic order which Christianity is specially called upon to consider in order to find out what may be the duty of Christians in relation to them, as compared with what socialism prescribes. The fourth part of "Science and Prayer," by William W. Kinsley, Washington, D. C., considers the question whether we can reasonably believe that God will interfere because we ask Him, doing for us what otherwise He would not have done.

The Charities Review, New York, Feb., 1892.

The facts and figures given in "The Louisiana Lottery," by Edgar Howard Farrar, have been printed before, perhaps many times; but we have never seen them put together so effectively as here; the article is a blow which will be felt. "Some Incidentals of Quasi-Public Charity," by Alexander Johnson, Secretary of the Indiana Board of State Charities, contains several striking instances of dangerous or faulty methods in charities. Those instances have great sociological interest, but are here principally used to emphasize the proposition that charity institutions become useless or perhaps mischievous when bereft of the living, personal sympathy of their members and left to their own merely mechanical working. A fit illustration of the truth of that proposition is "Dr. Samuel G. Howe," by Samuel M. Jackson, properly an introductory review of F. B. Sanborn's book on Dr. Howe, but by itself a sympathetic conception materialized with impressive directness in a rapid outline. "White Slaves," by Joseph Lee, is a review of Rev. Louis Albert Banks's book of the same name, but the sympathy is here tempered with a number of corrections.

Christian Thought (bi-monthly), New York, Feb., 1892.

"The influence of Association," by Rev. W. C. Wilbor, Ph.D., Buffalo, N. Y., is an exposition of the laws which govern the association of ideas, and the part those laws play in the mental and moral development of mankind. "Calvinism and Art," by Dr. Abraham Kuyper, translated by Rev. J. Hendrik De Vries, Yonkers, N. Y., is an original, sometimes a little too subtle, but at many points very striking development of an æsthetical principle within the pale of strict Calvinism. In "Matter and Man," Rev. Charles W. Millard, Ph.D., New York, places agnosticism face to face with revelation, and points out very impressively what man receives to live with from the one and from the other. Of a similar bearing is "Doubts and Doubters," by Rev. J. Q. Adams, San Francisco.

The Church Quarterly Review, London, Jan., 1892.

The opening article is an elaborate and partially commendatory review of "The Incarnation of the Son of God," by Charles Gore, M.A., Principal of Pusey House. Exceptions are taken, however, to Principal Gore's representation of the authority of the Church as not fully adequate; to a certain tendency to confuse the real distinction between the natural and the supernatural, to the view presented of our Lord's human knowledge, at which occasion a strongly pronounced argument is delivered in the present christological debate, etc. The second article, "Bishop Ellicott on Old Testament Criticism," gives a survey of the development and present state of Old Testament criticism; the traditional view, the analytic theory, and the intermediate position occupied by some scholars of the Anglican Church—Gore, Driver, Cheyne, etc.—at the same time pointing out the relation between those standpoints and the recent book by Bishop Ellicott, "Christus Comprobator." The third article, "Recent Works on Natural Religion," is not so much a review of the books mentioned in the sub-title—"Natural Religion," by Max Müller; "Physical Religion," by the same author; "Natural Religion," by Henry Sebastian Bowden; "Natural Theology," by Professor G. G. Stokes, and "Manual of the Science of Religion," by P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye—as a stricter definition, drawn from those sources, of the two terms natural religion and revealed religion, and the relation between them. The fourth article is a severe criticism of Professor Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" and a still severer attack on higher criticism, its methods and its results. A characteristic and important article is also "The Church Missionary Society and Proselytism," an account of the troubles which Protestant missionaries have recently experienced in Asia Minor.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Review (quarterly), Nashville, Tenn., Jan., 1892.

Besides the concluding part of the "History of Infant Baptism," by Rev. Professor J. D. Kirkpatrick, D.D., Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., the present number contains interesting "Historical Sketches of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church" from Illinois, by Rev. W. T. Rodgers; Missouri, Rev. T. B. Rice; Arkansas, Rev. C. R. Moore; East Tennessee, Rev. G. H. Silvius; and Indiana, Rev. A. H. Kelso. "St. Paul and the Roman Law," by W. E. Ball, LL.D., is a novel, but, no doubt, very fruitful kind of research, infusing new vigor in many of the apostle's ideas by demonstrating the reference to Roman law on which they are based. "Seven Failures of Ultra-Calvinism," by Rev. John Miller, Princeton, N. J., is a criticism of the ultra-Calvinistic standpoint, rather sharp in its reasoning, but lenient in spirit. "Social Life in the Church," by Rev. J. G. Patton, Brownsville, Pa., is an analysis of the social character of or the social elements involved in the very idea of the Christian Church.

The Expositor, London, Feb., 1892.

"Dr. Driver's Introduction to the Old Testament Literature," by Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Canon of Rochester, is the first part of an elaborate and carefully argued review recommending the truly religious candor of the author, his insight into critical methods, and his sympathetic interest in the difficulties of the ordinary orthodox believer, but doubting that the actual position of Old Testament criticism can be sufficiently understood from his work. Then follow the second part of "The Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament," by Rev. Professor Joseph Agar Beet, D.D.; the second part of "The Miracles of Christ," by Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Dean of Armagh, and the first part of "The Historical Geography of the Holy Land," by Rev. George Adam Smith, M.A. The title and the few opening paragraphs of this article may or may not be the happiest introduction to the reader which could be found, but the article itself cannot fail to surprise and charm him. It treats the first of those five parallel zones which with the crossing form the groundwork of the whole configuration of the country—the coast and the maritime plain. The descriptive part is based altogether on personal investigation, and is as precise and striking in the lines it draws as exquisite and rich in the colors it lays on; it is graphic in the highest sense of the word, for not one point is left dim and not one word is wasted. And still more interesting this singularly charming picture becomes when the writer begins to apply it on the one side to history in general, on the other to the moral and religious development of the inhabitants of the country. That coastline is set singing in the very Psalms.

The Expository Times, Edinburgh and London, Feb., 1892.

An interesting feature of the present number forms the article "Discussions and Notes on the Unpardonable Sin," by Rev. William Dale, New Barnet; Right Rev. W. Alexander, D.D., Bishop of Derry and Raphoe; Rev. President Edward Parker, D.D., Manchester; Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, D.D., Glasgow, and Rev. Daniel Moore, D.D., Editor of the *Christian Commonwealth;* the notes are long or short, practical or theological in their bearings, but always suggestive. The list of books given in "My Most Useful Books," by Rev. Principal Elmer Harding, M.A., St. Alban's College, Birkenhead, England, as those by which he has been benefited the most in his studies, may prove of great use to many a young student of theology, the more so as the name of each book is accompanied with explanatory notes. Of specifically expository interest are the papers on Isaiah ii. 9–21; Hebrews i. 14; Hebrews i. and ii., and Ephesians iii. 19.

Good Words, London, Feb., 1892.

Besides instalments of fiction and several well-illustrated sketches, the first part of "London Street Life," by Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A., Morning Preacher at the Foundling Hospital; the concluding part of "Tewkesbury Abbey," by Very Rev. H. D. M. Spence, D.D., Dean of Gloucester; "The Manchester Ship Canal," by David Paton, etc., the present number contains four interesting and impressive Sunday readings on "Questions of the Christian Life," by Right Rev. A. W. Thorold, D.D., Lord Bishop of Winchester; a new exposition of the parable of "Lazarus and Dives," by Rev. George Matheson, M.A., D.D., Minister of St. Bernard's, Edinburgh, and an amusing article on "Madame Blavatzky and the Theosophical Society," by Frank Padmore, M.A., Secretary of the Society for Psychical Research, in which the tricks employed by the founders of said society are fully exposed.

The Homiletic Review, New York, London, Toronto, Feb., 1892.

"The Inerrancy of Scripture," by Rev. Principal Alfred Cave, B.A., D.D., Hackney College, London, England, starts from the thesis that revelation necessarily implies inerrancy, though inspiration does not. What God expressly reveals must be true; but many have come beneath the inspiration of His Spirit without being rendered infallible thereby. In "Athletic Virtues," by President William DeWitt Hyde, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., each point of an athlete's virtue is described until its principle becomes apparent, and then the principle is followed from the sphere of athletics to the sphere of homiletics—a light touch and a clear, ringing tone. The little essay is a gem which leaves every reader in debt to the writer. "Protestantism and Roman Catholicism as Factors in Civilization," by Professor George H. Schodde, Ph.D., Columbus, O., is a rapid glance over the field, but sharp enough to sustain the assertion that the progress of human society is identical with the progress of Protestantism. "Elements of Effective Preaching," by Rev. R. T. Cross, Minneapolis, Minn., is also a bright and striking paper.

Methodist Review (bi-monthly), New York, March–April, 1892.

"What is the Resurrection?" by L. R. Fiske, D.D., LL.D., President of Albion College, gives a positive exposition of the doctrine of resurrection according to Scripture, interwoven with criticism of various false and blinding conceptions. In "The Compulsory Location of Inefficient Travelling Preachers," J. M. Buckley, D.D., LL.D., Editor of the *Christian Advocate*, treats the question what to do with a member of an Annual Conference who does not make a useful travelling preacher or fill acceptably any one of the class of appointments at the disposal of a bishop, and treats it with respect to its principle, the historical precedents, and the interpretation of fundamental law. "Divorce" is considered from its various aspects by C. W. Smith, D.D., Editor of the Pittsburgh *Christian Advocate;* Hon. H. L. Sibley, Marietta, O., and H. W. Rogers, President of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. Of particular interest are also "The Church in the South," by G. E. P. Albert, D.D., Editor of the *Southwestern Christian Advocate*, and "The Doctrine of Pan-Slavism," by Rev. Stephen Thomoff, Bulgaria.

The Missionary Herald, Boston, Feb., 1892.

Besides a number of interesting "Letters from the Missions" in Turkey, China, Japan, Mexico, etc., the present number contains a "Sketch of the Cesaria Station, Western Turkey," by Rev. W. A. Farnsworth, D.D., Cesarea: a report of the success achieved by "The Training School for Girls at San Sebastian, Spain," by Rev. William H. Gulick, and a very pertinent question, "Gold or Souls—Which?" by Mrs. Sarah E. Holbrook, Mopumul, Natal, South Africa.

The Missionary Review of the World, London, New York, Toronto, Feb., 1892.

The present number contains four articles on China—"The Importance of Winning China for Christ," by Rev. John R. Hykes, Kiukiang, China; "How the Gospel Spreads in China," by Rev. John Ross, Moukden, North China; "Foreign Influence in China," by Rev. A. P. Parker, Shanghai, China, and "One of the Faithful in the Land," by C. J. Vos Kamp, Canton, China. These articles offer a large amount of reliable and much needed information on a subject of the greatest importance. As the Chinese Empire comprises one fourth of the human race, the success or the failure of the Christian mission among those peoples will have an influence on the history of mankind deeper and more decisive than any other historical agency hitherto known.

The Newbery House Magazine, London, Feb., 1892.

In the opening article Rev. Canon Carter gives an exposition of the doctrine of "The Intercession of Christ" according to Scripture, with some introductory remarks on the reasons why that doctrine in later times seems to have grown vaguer and dimmer. "Disestablishment and Professor Goldwin Smith," by Rev. Henry Hayman, D.D., is a sharp answer to an article on disestablishment, by Professor Goldwin Smith in the *Nineteenth Century*, emphasizing the change that idea has undergone since its first appearance, when it simply meant "disestablishment," while now it really means "disendowment." For the article "Church Folk-Lore," by Rev. J. E. Vaux, F.S.A., see above. "Leaves from the History of the Guilds of the City of London," by Charles Welch, traces at various points the connection between the London of Saxon times and London of to-day.

New Englander and Yale Review, New Haven, Feb., 1892.

"The Half-Way Covenant," by Williston Walker, is an exhaustive and final analysis of that movement in New England life, learned and clear. "Some of Ibsen's Women," by Daniel Kilham Dodge, makes a distinction between the female character in Ibsen's earlier dramas and those of his later, "as though Shakespeare had taken to writing society plays in the style of 'Jim the Penman.'" In "Apologetics in the Pulpit" Frank Hugh Foster draws the limits within which apologetics should be applied in the pulpit, and then gives some hints with respect to the proper application. "Does the Church Believe in the Incarnation?" by Charles C. Starbuck, is an argument in the present christological debate accepting the proposition that Christ's knowledge of empirical facts was limited by His opportunities of gaining it.

The Old and New Testament Student, Hartford, Conn., Feb., 1892.

"The Evidence of Compilation," by Professor Henry P. Smith, Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O., is a kind of summary which will recommend itself to the reader because it is confined to facts and entirely free of hypothetical inferences. "The Religious Ideas of the First Book of Maccabees," by Frank C. Porter, Yale Divinity School, is an analysis of the theological contents of that book, and the same character has "The Book of Ecclesiastes," by Professor F. B. Denio, Bangor, Me. The number also contains the second part of "The Discovery and Decipherment of the Cuneiform Inscriptions," by Robert Francis Harper, Ph.D.

Our Day, Boston and Chicago, Feb., 1892.

The "Jesuit Aggression in the Public Schools of Minnesota" contains the spirited report of the Minneapolis Union Ministers' Meeting upon the recent educational movement in Faribault and Stillwater, Minn., and uncovers the stealthy movements by which the Jesuits try to circumvent the law and infringe upon the American Common School system. Another article, "College Students as Rumsellers," gives a letter from William Lloyd Garrison, a son of the celebrated abolitionist, to the President and Faculty of Harvard College, arraigning the secret society of students, D. K. E., for rather serious offences, and places the whole affair under debate.

The Review of the Churches, London, Feb., 1892.

"The Progress of the Churches" is depicted by Archdeacon Farrar, who writes on the new bishops of Carlisle and Sodor and Man; Bishop Harold Browne, the School Board, and the Bible and Modern Criticism; by Dr. Fraser on the Presbyterianism of Archbishop Tait; Dr. Mackennal, on the Congregational Year Book; Dr. Clifford, on the Centenary of the Baptist Missionary Society, and Mr. Bunting, on Two New Methodist Monthlies. For the article on "The Church and Labor Problems," see above. Under "the Great Philanthropies" (IV.), the Venerable Archdeacon Farrar gives an outline of the origin, organization, history, and activity of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The number gives, as usual, a survey of the leading articles of the month, of missionary progress and problems, of books on religious topics, etc.

The Thinker, London, Feb., 1892.

The three articles, "The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter," by Rev. Professor W. T. Davison, M.A.; "Maccabean Psalms," by Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, M.A., and "Canon Cheyne's Bampton Lectures on the Psalter," by Rev. Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, B.D., are criticisms of Canon Cheyne's recently published work on the Psalter, doubting his methods and rejecting his results, though without making any positive assertions with respect to the traditional standpoint. "The Greatness of John the Baptist," by Rev. Principal David Brown, D.D., is an historical and psychological exposition of the position which John the Baptist occupies in the economy of the Church of God, and "Our Lord's Knowledge as Man," by Rev. Professor W. F. Adeney, M.A., is a very able contribution to that series of christological researches which were started when radical critics asserted that the One Hundred and Tenth Psalm was not written by David, while conservative scholars appeal to the authority of our Lord, who evidently ascribes the Psalm to David.

The Young Man, London, Feb., 1892.

The story by Tighe Hopkins, "The Letting of Quinto," has two good qualities—to be very short, not larger than a medium-sized cup of coffee, and to be very amusing, as harmlessly exhilarating as a cup of good coffee. Sound and alive are also the two pieces on "The Best Use of Leisure," of which the first, by Edmund Gosse, demands free moments in a thronged life for the same reason as open squares are wanted in a thronged city; while the other, by A. W. W. Dale, M.A., points out that the leisure of a young man must be a preparation for the leisure of his manhood. Of the same character is the first instalment of "Studies of Heads," by Edward Garrett, calling attention to the fact that "the man with a great deal of his head in his collar is not to be ignored." Nor is the harmony of the whole number broken when the articles rise in seriousness and gravity, as "Platform and Pulpit," by T. Davidson, and "Young Men of the Bible," by C. S. Horne.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, February, 1892.

Ethnic Religion in its Relation to Christianity. Prof. Gerhart.
Our Ethical Resources. President Hyde.
The Duty of Scientific Theology to the Church of To-day. Prof. Pfleiderer.
The Figures of Homer. Miss Julia H. Caverno.
"Rembrandt as Educator." H. C. Bierwith, Ph.D.
"Life in Himself." Prof. Tucker.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA (QUARTERLY).

Oberlin, Ohio, January, 1892.

Authenticity and Inspiration of the Scriptures. Rev. James H. Fairchild, D.D.
Socialism in its Bearings on Capital, Labor, and Poverty. Rev. James Macgregor, D.D.
Resurrection and Final Judgment. II. Rev. Edmund B. Fairfield, D.D., LL.D.
Science and Prayer. IV. William W. Kinsley.
Prophetic Testimony to the Pentateuch. Rev. Henry Hayman, D.D.
The Miracles of the Bible. Rev. Abel Hinzinger, Ph.D.

THE CHARITIES REVIEW.

New York, February, 1892.

The Louisiana Lottery: Its History. Edgar Howard Farrar.
Some Incidentals of Quasi-Public Charity. Alexander Johnson.
District Nursing. Isabel Hampton.
The Hull-House. Alice Miller.
Dr. Samuel G. Howe. Samuel Macauley Jackson.
White Slaves: The Oppression of Worthy Poor. Joseph Lee.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT (BI-MONTHLY).

New York, February, 1892.

The Influence of Association. Rev. W. C. Wilbor, Ph.D.
Calvinism and Art. Dr. Abraham Kuyper.
Matter and Man Rev. Charles W. Millard, Ph.D.
Doubts and Doubters. Rev. J. G. Adams.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

January, 1892.

Gore's Bampton Lectures.
Bishop Ellicott on Old Testament Criticism.
Recent Works on Natural Religion.
Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.
Bishop Charles Wordsworth's Autobiography.
Patristic Evidence and the Gospel Chronology.
The Spanish Calendar, 1538–42.
Swift's Life and Writings.
England in the Eighteenth Century.
The Progress of Classical Studies.
The Church Missionary Society and Proselytism.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW (QUARTERLY).

Nashville, Tenn., January, 1892.

History of Infant Baptism. Rev. Prof. J. D. Kirkpatrick, D.D.
St. Paul and the Roman Law. W. E. Ball, LL.D.
Historical Sketches of the Cumberland Presbyterian Churches in Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, East Tennessee, and Indiana.
Seven Failures of Ultra-Calvinism. Rev. John Miller.
The Idea of God. Rev. B. Margeson.
The Possibilities of Salvation a Common Heritage. Rev. John L. Robinson.
Sin: Its Origin, and the Effect of Adam's Sin on his Posterity. Rev. J. T. A. Henderson.
Social Life in the Church. Rev. J. G. Patton.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, February, 1892.

Dr. Driver's Introduction to the Old Testament Literature. I. Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.
The Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament. II. Rev. Prof Joseph Agar Beet, D.D.
The Miracles of Christ. II. Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.
The Historical Geography of the Holy Land. I. Rev. George Adam Smith, M.A.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Edinburgh and London, February, 1892.

Two Old Testament Scholars. Rev. Prof. A. B. Davidson, LL.D.
My Most Useful Books. Rev. Principal Elmer Harding, M.A.
The Early Narratives of Genesis. Rev. Prof. Herbert E. Ryle, M.A.
Discussions and Notes on the Unpardonable Sin
Rev. William Dale.
Right Rev. W. Alexander, D.D.
Rev. President Edward Parker, D.D.
Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, D.D.
Rev. Daniel Moore, D.D.
Apologetics. Rev. Prof. J. S. Banks.
Expository Papers: Isaiah ii. 9–21; Hebrews i. 14; Hebrews i., ii.; Ephesians iii. 19.

GOOD WORDS.

London, February, 1892.

The Magic Ink. III., IV. William Black.
Madame Blavatsky and the Theosophical Society. Frank Podmore, M.A.
London Street Life. I. Rev. A. R. Buckland, M A.
John Hoppner, R. A. Robert Walker.
The Manchester Ship Canal. David Paton.
Lazarus and Dives. George Matheson, D.D.
Tewkesbury Abbey. The Dean of Gloucester.
The Moon. I. Sir S. A. Ball, LL.D.
Alston Crucis. III., IV. Helen Shipton.
Questions of the Christian Life. The Lord Bishop of Winchester.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York, London, Toronto, February, 1892.

The Inerrancy of Scripture. Rev. Principal Alfred Cave, B.A., D.D.
The Microscope. Prof. Ogden Doremus, M.D., LL.D.
Athletic Virtues. President William De Witt Hyde.
Protestantism and Roman Catholicism as Factors in Civilization. Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph.D.
Elements of Effective Preaching. Rev. R. T. Cross.

METHODIST REVIEW (BI-MONTHLY).

New York, March–April, 1892.

What is the Resurrection? L. R. Fiske, D.D, LL.D.
The Compulsory Location of Inefficient Travelling Preachers. J. M. Buckley, D.D., LL.D.
Divorce. C. W. Smith, D.D.
H. L. Schley.
H. W. Rogers, LL.D.
The Church in the South. A. E. P. Albert, D.D.
Methodist Laymen. T. A. Goodwin, D.D.
William Wordsworth. Rev. A. Copland. M.A.
The Doctrine of Pan-Slavism. Rev. Stephen Thomoff.

THE MISSIONARY HERALD.

Boston, February, 1892.

Tabular View of the Missions of the A. B. C. F. M. for the Year 1890–91.
Sketch of the Cesarea Station. Rev. W. A. Farnsworth, D.D.
The Training Schools for Girls at San Sebastian. Rev. William H. Gulick.
Gold or Souls—Which? Mrs. Sarah E. Holbrook.
Letters from the Missions.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD.

London, New York, Toronto, February, 1892.

The Importance of Winning China for Christ. Rev. John R. Hykes.
How the Gospel Spreads in China. Rev. John Ross.
Foreign Influence in China. Rev. A. P. Parker.
The Great Missionary Uprising. Rev. D. L. Leonard.
An Evangelistic Tour in Japan. Rev. Frederick S. Curtis.
One of the Faithful of the Land. C. J. Vos Kamp.

THE NEWBERY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, February, 1892.

The Intercession of Christ. Rev. Canon Carter.
Disestablishment and Professor Goldwin Smith. Rev. Henry Hayman, D.D.
Church Folklore. Rev. J. E. Vaux, F.S.A.
Sydney Smith. Mrs. L. B. Walford.
No Compromise. XXIV.–XXVIII. Helen Hetherington and Rev. Darwin Burton.
Laurence Oliphant. Rev. Canon W. J. Knox Little.
Guilds of the City of London. Charles Welsh.
The Story that Rex Told his Wife. "Fleur-de-Lys."
An Affair of Honor. Alice Weber.

NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

New Haven, February, 1892.

The Half-Way Covenant. Williston Walker.
Some of Ibsen's Women. Daniel Kilham Dodge.
Apologetics in the Pulpit. Frank Hugh Foster.
In Early September with the Birds.
Does the Church Believe in the Incarnation? Charles C. Starbuck.
Distinguishing Marks on Ballots. Henry T. Blake.
Taxation of Church Property.
Independence in Politics. Linton Satterthwait.

THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., February, 1892.

James Strong, S.T.D., LL.D. Rev. J. W. Mendenhall, D.D.
The Evidence of Compilation. Prof. Henry P. Smith.
The Religious Ideas of the First Book of Maccabees. Prof. Frank C. Porter.
The Discovery and Decipherment of the Cuneiform Inscriptions. Robert Francis Harper, Ph.D.
The Book of Ecclesiastes. Prof. F. B. Denio.
The Founding of the Christian Church. Clyde W. Votaw.

OUR DAY.

Boston and Chicago, February, 1892.

University Extension in the United States Prof. E. J. James.
Jesuit Aggression in the Public Schools of Minnesota.
Robert Browning's Theology.
College Students as Rumsellers. William Lloyd Garrison.
Rights and Wrongs of the Red Men.
Boston Monday Lectures. Joseph Cook.

THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

London, February, 1892.

The Progress of the Churches.
Archdeacon Farrar.
Dr. Fraser.
Dr. Mackennal.
Dr. Clifford.
Mr. Bunting.
The Church and Labor Problems.
Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Wakefield.
Sir John Gorst.
The Warden of Toynbee Hall.
Rev. H. T. Smart.
Mr. Ben Tillett.
The British and Foreign Bible Society.
Ven. Archdeacon Farrar.

SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

Edinburgh, London and Dublin, February, 1892.

Half-Brothers. VI.-XI.
Hesba Stretton.
Not Laughed Down.
Rev. E. J. Hardy, M.A.
Authority and Faith.
Rev. Canon Scott-Holland, M.A.
A Seven-Centuried Home.
Geoffrey Winterwood.
The Home Secretary. II.
Carmen Sylva.
The Master Worker. Rev. S. A. Tipple.
The Jewish Colony in London. II.
Mrs. Brewer.
Golden Dust. E. Robertson Croom.
Our Bible. Rev. Canon Talbot, M.A.
Natural Chloroform. Rev. T. Wood.
Four Boys of Long Ago.
Rev. Martin Lewis, B.A.

THE THINKER.

London, February, 1892.

The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter.
Rev. Prof. W. T. Davison, M.A.
Maccabean Psalms.
Rev. Prof. W. H. Bennett, M.A.
Canon Cheyne's Bampton Lectures on the Psalter.
Rev. Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy, B.D.
The Greatness of John the Baptist.
Rev. Principal David Brown, D.D.
Asaph or Isaiah ?
Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, M.A.
Studies in the Minor Prophets.
Rev. J. T. L. Maggs, B.A.
Our Lord's Knowledge as Man.
Rev. Prof. W. F. Adeney, D.D.

THE YOUNG MAN.

London, February, 1892.

The Letting of Quinta. Tighe Hopkins.
The Best Use of Leisure.
Edmund Gosse.
A. W. Dale, M.A.
Scientific Hobbies. Frank Ballard, A.M.
Studies of Heads. Edward Garrett.
Echoes from the Study. W. J. Dawson.
Young Men of the Bible. C. S. Horne.
George Meredith. W. J. Dawson.
The World of Business. J. H. Osborne.
Platform and Pulpit. T. Davidson.

CONTENTS OF THE MARCH MAGAZINES.

Summary of contents : William Dean Howells's new novel, "The World of Chance," begins in Harper's Magazine for March. Judging from the opening chapters alone, this story promises to outrival in interest anything hitherto written by that distinguished author. This number of the magazine is also especially strong in American subjects. Julian Ralph contributes a graphic article on "The Capitals of the Northwest"—meaning the twin cities of Minnesota and the twin lake ports, Duluth and Superior—in which he gives some surprising figures regarding the phenomenal growth and prosperity of those cities. In another article, entitled "Talking Musquash"—which article is superbly illustrated from drawings by Remington—the same writer concludes his wonderfully entertaining description of the Hudson Bay country and the fur-trading industry of the Northwest. Edward Anthony Bradford writes an able and trenchant article on "America for the Americans," The very interesting series of "Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne," by Horatio Bridge, is brought to a conclusion. William McLennan, in the unique dialect of the French-Canadian *habitant*, tells the story of "Johnnie Rawson and Chunky Peters," which is illustrated by Reinhart. In an article on "Our Gray Squirrels"—illustrated by J. C. Beard—Ernest Ingersoll, in his usual engaging manner, gives a careful study of the habits and characteristics of these interesting little creatures. The second of the noteworthy series of Danube articles, "From the Black Forest to the Black Sea," strengthens the good impressions made by the first. It is written by Poultney Bigelow and richly illustrated by Alfred Parsons and F. D. Millet. Mr. De Blowitz, in another chapter of his memoirs, entitled "Alfonso XII. Proclaimed King of Spain," gives a characteristic account of a remarkable feat of journalism, which led to his appointment as chief correspondent of the London *Times* in Paris. With an article on the "London of George the Second," which is profusely illustrated by E. A. Abbey and others, Walter Besant brings his valuable and very popular series of London papers to a close. Constance Fenimore Woolson contributes an Italian story, "Dorothy," which is appropriately illustrated from drawings by C. S. Reinhart. The Editorial Departments are conducted, as usual, by George William Curtis, William Dean Howells, and Charles Dudley Warner.

The following is the contents of the Century for March : Portrait of Paderewski, engraved by T. Johnson, frontispiece; "St Paul's Cathedral," Mrs. Schuyler van Rensselaer ; "The Naulahka," a story of West and East, Rudyard Kipling and Wolcott Balestier ; "I Saw the Clouds at Morning's Hour," Langdon Elwyn Mitchell ; "The United States Fish Commission," some of its works, Richard Rathbun ; "Characteristics," IV., S. Weir Mitchell, M.D. ; "Genius within Hearing of Death," Charlotte Fiske Bates ; "Giorgione" (Italian Old Masters), W. J. Stillman ; notes and engravings by T. Cole ; "The Bluebird," Richard E. Burton ; "Paderewski : A Critical Study," William Mason ; "Paderewski : A Biographical Sketch," Fanny Morris Smith ; "How Paderewski Plays," Richard Watson Gilder ; "Gay's Romance," by the author of "The Anglomaniacs," Mrs. Burton Harrison ; "My Enemy," Alice Williams Brotherton ; "Middle Georgia Rural Life," Richard Malcolm Johnston ; "Ol' Pap's Flaxen" (in three parts), Part I., Hamlin Garland; "The Silver Thaw," Charles G. D. Roberts ; "The Nature and Elements of Poetry," I., Oracles Old and New, Edmund Clarence Stedman ; "Our Tolstoi Club," Dorothy Prescott ; "Love and Life," Julie M. Lippmann ; portrait of Miss Beatrice Goelet, painted by John S. Sargent ; "The Village Romance," Viola Roseboro' ; "Ode to Spring," Mrs. James T. Fields ; "Love is a Bird," William Prescott Foster ; "The Farmer and Railway Legislation," Henry C. Adams ; "When from the Tense Cords of that Mighty Lyre," Thomas Bailey Aldrich ; "An Acquaintance with Hans Christian Andersen," Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen.

Scribner's Magazine for March contains : "Echoes of the Waltz," frontispiece (see American Illustration of To-day), from a painting by C. S. Reinhart. "On a Bust of General Grant," by James Russell Lowell, with a fac-simile of a part of Mr. Lowell's manuscript. "The Water-Route from Chicago to the Ocean," by Charles C. Rogers, Lieutenant U. S. Navy, drawings by Carlton T. Chapman and Victor Pérard, engraving by E. H. Del'Orme, C. I. Butler, and Van Ness, with three maps. "A New England Kismet," by Alice Morse Earle. "Small Country Places," by Samuel Parsons, Jr., Superintendent of Parks, New York, drawings by Victor Pérard, engraving by Witte, Van Ness, C. I. Butler, Varley, and George Del'Orme. "The Wrecker" (chapters xviii.-xix.), by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne (begun in August, 1891—to be continued), with a full-page illustration by W. L. Metcalf. "American Illustration of To-day," third (concluding) paper, by William A. Coffin, with examples of the work of Edwin A. Abbey, C. S. Reinhart, Joseph Pennell, Howard Pyle, A. B. Frost, W. T. Smedley, T. de Thulstrup, O. H. Bacher, S. W. Van Schaick, Frederic Remington, A. E. Sterner, Chester Loomis, and C. D. Gibson. "Paris Theatres and Concerts" (II. The Opéra, the Opéra-Comique, and the Conservatoire), by William F. Apthorp, drawings by Sinibaldi, Eugène Morand, Kenyon Cox, and O. H. Bacher, engraving by Peckwell, E. H. Del'Orme, and Merrill. "The Reflections of a Married Man" (chapters i.-iii.), by Robert Grant, to run through four numbers. "Two Portraits," by Lloyd McKim Garrison, with a decoration by Frank Fowler. "Speed in Locomotives:" I. The Limitations of Fast Running, by M. N. Forney, Editor Railroad and Engineering Journal ; II. Train-Speed a Question of Transportation, by Theodore N. Ely, General Superintendent Motive Power, Pennsylvania R. R. ; III. A Practical Experiment, by H. Walter Webb, Third Vice-President, New York Central. "A Girl of Pompeii," by Edward S. Martin. The Point of View. The Ethics of "Unloading"—Wordsworth's Arcady—A Weak Point of the Specialist—"Scholars in Politics."

The contents of the Atlantic Monthly for March are as follows : "An Old English Township," Brooke Herford ; "Don Orsino" (vi., vii.), F. Marion Crawford ; "Through the Rushes," Florence Earle Coates ; "Harvest-Tide on the Volga," Isabel F. Hapgood ; "The Children's Poets," Agnes Repplier ; "A Belle of St. Valerien," Joel Chandler Harris ; "The Little Children of Cybele," Edith M. Thomas ; "Thomas Chandler Haliburton," F. Blake Crofton ; "The American Pessimist," Gamaliel Bradford, Jr. ; "Doubts about University Extension." George Herbert Palmer ; "A Metamorphosis," Elizabeth Backus Mason ; "A Village Watch-Tower," Kate Douglas Wiggin ; "Why the Men of '61 Fought for the Union," Jacob Dolson Cox ; "A Political Parallel," "Recent French Essays," "The Figure of Columbus," "Old Furniture in New England," "Comment on New Books," "The Contributors' Club."

Lippincott's Magazine for March contains : "A Soldier's Secret," by Capt. Charles King, U. S. A. ; "The Newspaper-Man as a Confidant" (the Journalist Series), by A. E. Watrous ; "Horsemanship and Polo" (Athletic Series), by Foxhall Keene ; "One Hundred Miles an Hour," by Charles R. Deacon ; "Days and Nights" (a poem), by Anne Reeve Aldrich ; "Pompthero," by Lillian A. North ; "Ibsen's Earlier Work," by C. H. Herford ; "Rebuilding the Navy" (illustrated), by Harry P. Mawson ; "The Balance" (a poem), by S. Decatur Smith, Jr. ; "Touch and Go," by M. G. McClelland ; "Defeat" (a quatrain), by Clinton Scollard ; "An Independent Theatre," by Edward Fuller ; "The Independent or Free Theatre of New York," by James L. Ford ;

"Sleep" (a poem), by Ruth Johnston; "After Life's Storm" (a quatrain), by Nora C. Franklin; "Getting There," by Robert Timsol; "As it Seems;" "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading artists).

THE COSMOPOLITAN for March contains the following: Frontispiece, from a water-color by Leon Moran; "The Cathedral at Cologne," illustrated, Elizabeth Bisland; "Fair Imogen upon the Stage," illustrated, Charles E. L. Wingate; "Strawberry Hill and the Countess Waldegrave," illustrated, Adam Badeau; "An Episode in Mexico," illustrated by F. Hopkinson Smith, Eleanor Seymour Sea; "From an Ex-Guardsman's Note-Book," illustrated, Henry Arthur Herbert, Thomas Donnelly; "Trailing Yew." illustrated by C. R. Grant, Patience Stapleton; "A Night with a Leopard," illustrated by D. C. Beard, Macmahon Challinor; "The Political Cartoons" of John Tenniel, illustrated by F. G. Atwood and from *Punch*, E. C. Reynolds; "The Columbian World's Fair," illustrated by Harry Fenn, M. H. De Young; "The Touch of the Wand" (poem), William Waterfield; "The Archbishop's Unguarded Moment," illustrated by Charles Howard Johnson, Oscar Fay Adams; "Problems of Aerial Navigation," illustrated by F. G. Atwood and J. N. Hutchins, the Editor; "Social Problems," Edward Everett Hale; "A War-Time Postscript;" "American Fiction Again," Brander Matthews.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Adductus. I dominatori della Chiesa. Venezia, 1891. Pp. 481, 8vo. (5 mk)

Alford, B. H. Nutford Place Sermons, preached in St. Luke's Church, Nutford Place. London: Stott, 1892. Pp. 238, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Allen, A. J. C. The Church Catechism: Its History and Contents. A manual for teachers and students. London: Longmans, 1892. Pp. 220, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Andrews, Samuel J. The Life of our Lord upon the Earth Considered in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations. A new and wholly revised edition. New York: Scribners, 1892. Pp. xxvii., 651, 8vo, $2.50. (Originally published 1863.)

Armknecht, O. Die Hoffnung der Kirche und ihre Bedeutung für das christliche Leben. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1892. Pp. iv., 132, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Assyriologische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von Frdr. Delitzsch und Paul Haupt. 8. Band. Inhalt: Sassumukin, König von Babylonien 668–648 vor Christum. Inschriftliches Material über den Beginn seiner Regierung. Grossentheils zum 1. Male herausgegeben und erläutert von C. F. Lehmann. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. xiv., 173, 118, mit 47 autographischen und 1 lichtdruchten Tafeln, 4to, 40 mk. (I. 1-4; II.; III. 1; IV.–VI.; VIII. und IX., 354 mk.)

Avenarius, Richard, Prof., Dr. Der menschliche Weltbegriff. Leipzig: Reisland, 1892. Pp. xxiv., 133, 8vo, 4 mk.

Avencebrolis (Ibn Gebirol). Fons Vitæ ex arabico in latinum translatus ab Johanne Hispano et Dominico Gundissalino. Ex codicibus Parisinis, Amploniano, Columbino primum edidit Clem. Baeumker. Fasc. I. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Clem. Baeumker. 1. Band, 2. Heft.) Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1892. Pp. vii., 71, 8vo, 2.75 mk.

Baily, T. L., Rev. Open Ways. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1892. Pp. 304, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Berthand, A. Sancti Augustini doctrina de pulchro ingenuisque artibus e variis illius operibus excerpta. Pp. xii., 116, p. 8vo. Poitiers: Oudin, 1892.

Berthelet, G. La Elezione del Papa. Storia e documenti. Roma: Forzani, 1891. Pp. viii., 318, 8vo, 3 l.

Bevan, A. A., M.A. A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel. For the use of students. London: Frowde, 1892. Pp. 230, 8vo, 8s.

Blake, B. How to Read the Prophets: Being the Prophecies Arranged Chronologically in their Historical Setting. With explanations, maps, and glossary. Edinburgh: Clark, 1892. Pp. 230, p. 8vo, 4s.

Boileau, J., Abbé. Le Livre de l'Ecclésiaste, ou le discours inspiré du roi Salomon sur le soverain bien. Paraphrase. Paris: Dumoulin, 1892. Pp. 80, 8vo.

Bonk, Hugo. De Davide, Israelitarum rege. Pars I.: Quæstiones criticæ et historicæ in fontes habitæ. I. Dissertation. Königsberg i. Pr.: Koch, 1891. Pp. 78, 8vo, 1 mk.

Bonney, T. G. Christian Doctrines and Modern Thought. The Boyle Lectures for 1891. London: Longmans, 1892. Pp. 190, p. 8vo, 5s.

Bosc, Ernest. Isis dévoilée, ou l'Egyptologie sacrée. (Hieroglyphes, papyrus, livres d'Hermes, religion, mythes, symboles.) Paris: Chamuel, 1892. Pp. vi., 312, 18mo, 4 fr.

Bourne, W. St. H. Studies of the Spiritual Life: A Series of Mission Addresses. London: Skeffington, 1892. Pp. 116, 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Brandt, Samuel, Prof., Dr. Ueber die Entstehungsverhältnisse der Prosaschriften des Lactantius und des Buches de mentibus persecutorum. Wien: Tempsky, 1892. Pp. 138, 8vo, 2.60 mk.

Broad Churchman: A Catechism of Christian Pantheism. London: Sonnenschein, 1892. Pp. 188, p. 8vo, 1s.

Brookes, James H. Chaff and Wheat: A Defence of Verbal Inspiration. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. 46, 16mo, 15 cts.

Brooks, Phillips, Rt. Rev., D.D. The Symmetry of Life. An address to young men. Reprinted from "Second Series" of Sermons. New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. 32, 12mo, 25 cts.

Büchler, Adolf. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwickelung der hebräischen Accente. 1. Theil. Die Ursprünge der verticalen Bestandtheile in der Accentuation des hebräisches Bibeltextes und ihre masoretische Bedeutung. Wien: Tempsky, 1892. Pp. 182, 8vo, 3 60 mk.

Buhl, F. Canon and Text of the Old Testament. Translated by Rev. John Macpherson. Edinburgh: Clark, 1892. Pp. 250, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Byars, William Vincent. The Tempting of the King: A Study of the Law. In 3 parts. Part 1, Bathsheba; Part 2, Uriah; Part 3, Nathan. St. Louis: Alban, 1892. Pp. ii., 53, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Canet, V. Simon de Montfort et la croisade contre les Albigeois. Lille: Brouwer, 1892. Pp. 296, 8vo.

Carradine, B., Rev., D.D. Church Entertainments: Twenty Objections. Syracuse: Hall, 1892. Pp. 97, 12mo, 50 cts.

Chaplin, M. A. Chimes for the Times. With a preface by Rev. W. Lancelot Holland. London: Wileman, 1892. Pp. 124, p. 8vo, 2s. (Religious Poetry.)

Chemnitz, M. Von der Ursache der Sünde und von der Zufälligkeit. Aus dem *Locis* übersetzt von W. Hübener. Dresden: Naumann, 1891. Pp. iv., 87, 8vo, 1 mk.

Chroust, Ant., Dr. Tageno, Ansbert, und die Historia Perigrinorum. Drei Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Friederichs I. Graz: Styria, 1891. Pp. viii., 205, 8vo, 5 mk.

Church, R. W. Village Sermons Preached at Whatley. London: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. 316, p. 8vo, 16s.

Ciolli, A. Spicilegio casistico morale e canonico. Firenze, 1891. Pp. x., 524, 16mo. (4 mk.)

Coltman, Robert, Jr., M.D. The Chinese, their Present and Future: Medical, Political and Social. Philadelphia: Davis; London: Davis, 1891. Pp. viii., 212, 8vo, cloth, $1.75, 10s.

Computation of 666, and Its Relation to Anti-Christian Systems, but having Reference to a Person, the Coming Antichrist, who is to be Overthrown by the Sun of Righteousness. By two servants of Christ. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 406, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Congregational Year Book, 1892. London: Congregational Union, 1892. 8vo, 3s.

Correns, Paul, Dr. Die dem Boethius fälslich zugeschriebene Abhandlung des Dominicus Gundisalvi de Unitate. Herausgegeben und philosophiegeschichtlich behandelt. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen herausgegeben Von Prof. Dr. Clem. Baeumker, 1. Band, 1. Heft.) Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1892. Pp. 56, 8vo, 2 mk.

Cougny, Gaston, Prof. L'Art antique, Egypte, Chaldée, Assyrie, Perse, Asie Mineure, Phénicie. Choix de lectures sur l'histoire de l'art, l'esthétique et l'archéologie, accompagné de notes explicatives, historiques et bibliographiques, conforme aux derniers programmes de l'enseignement secondaire moderne. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1892. Pp. iv., 350, 8vo.

Cutts, E. L. Notes of Lessons on the Church in the New Testament. With map. London: C. K. Soc., 1892. Pp. 166, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Cyclopædia of Natural Teachings. Being a selection of facts, observations, suggestions, illustrations, examples, and illustrative hints taken from all departments of inanimate nature. With an introduction by Hugh Macmillan, LL.D. New York: Whittaker, 1892. Pp. xvi., 552, 8vo, $2.50.

Damian, Pater, der Held von Molokai. Freiburg i. Br.: 1891. Pp. 85, 12mo, 80 pf.

Darras, G. S. Storia generale della chiesa dal principio dell' èra cristiana ai nostri giorno. Vol. I. Torino, 1891. 16mo. (18 mk.)

Davis, A. The Hebrew Accents of the Twenty-one Books of the Bible. London: Nutt, 1892. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Delabarre. Edmund Burke, über Bewegungsempfindungen. Dissertation. Freiburg i. Br.: Fock, 1891. Pp. vi., 111, 8vo, 3 mk.

De la Broise, R. Mamerti Claudiani vita ejusque doctrina de anima hominis. Thesis. Paris: Retaux-Bray, 1892. Pp. xxv., 221, p. 8vo.

Didiot, Jules. Cours de théologie Catholique. Logique supernaturelle subjective. Lille: Lefort, 1892. Pp. xvi., 557, 8vo.

Dieckmann, Aug. Die Lehre von der Rechtferttigung aus den Glauben vom ethischen Gesichtspunkte aus dargestellt. Programm. Worms, 1891. Pp. 30, 4to.

Dijk, Is. van. Blaise Pascal, Girolamo Savonarola, Jeanne d'Arc. Historische Schetzen. Arnh.: Swaan, 1891. Pp. iv., 175, 8vo, 1.50 fl.

Dreves, G. M. Analecta Hymnica medii aevi. XI. Hymni inediti. Liturgische Hymnen des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken. Uebersetzt von——. 2. Folge. Leipzig: Reisland, 1892. Pp. 274, 8vo, 8 mk.

Ellis, J. J. Thomas Cromwell. London: Nisbet, 1892. Pp. 110, 12mo, 1s. ("Men with a Mission" Series.)

Emery, L. Religion et Théologie. Leçon inaugurale faite à l'Université de Lausanne. Lausanne: Rouge, 1891. Pp. 26, 8vo.

Euting, Jul. Sinaitischen Inschriften. Herausgeben mit Unterstützung der Königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Berlin: Reimer, 1891. Pp. xii., 92, mit 40 autographischen Tafeln. 24 mk.

Ewald, P. Der "geschichtliche Christus" und die synoptischen Evangelien. Ein Vortrag. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. iv., 35, 8vo, 75 pf.

Finke, H. Konzilien-Studien zur Geschichte des 13. Jahrhunderts. Ergänzungen und Berichtungen zu Hefele-Knöpfler "Conciliengeschichte" Bände V. und VI. Münster i. W.: Regensburg, 1892. Pp. vii., 123, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Fourrière, Abbé. La Bible travestie par Homère Iliade. Tom. 1. Fasc. 1. Introduction. Chants I.–III. Amiens: Rousseau-Leroy, 1891. Pp. xxiv., 160, 12mo.

Frank, Frdr. Die Kirche und die Juden. Eine Studie. Regensburg: Verlags-Anstalt, 1892. Pp. iii., 79, 8vo, 1 mk.

Frank, Fr. G. R., Prof., Dr. Dogmatische Studien. Leipzig: Deichert, 1891. Pp. iv., 135, 8vo, 2 mk.

Fredericks, J. De secte der Loïsten of Antwerpsche Libertijnen (1525–1545). Eligius Pruystinck (Loy de Schaliedecker) en zijne aanhangers. 'S Hage: Nijhoff, 1891. Pp. 60, 64, 8vo, 1.80 fl.

Funk, S. Die haggadischen Elemente in den Homilien des Aphraates, des persischen Weisen. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1891. Pp. 66, 8vo, 2 mk.

Gerhold, Heinrich W. Die Unfehlbarkeit der heiligen Schrift. Berden a. A.: Mahnke, 1892. Pp. 35, 16mo, 20 pf.

Gmelin, J., Dr. Evangelische Freiheit. Auch ein Beitrag zur Lösung der sozialen Frage. Tübingen: Fues, 1892. Pp. iv., 171, 2 mk.

Goulburn, Edward Meyrick, D.D. John William Burgon, late Dean of Chichester. 2 vols. New York: Scribners, 1892. 8vo, $9.00. (See bibliography for February.)

Grant, William D. The Pastor's Ready Reference of Service for Fifty Years. New York: Funk, 1892, 8vo, $1.50.

Grashoff, W. Alttestamentliche Bibelstunden zur Einführung der Gemeinde in das Verständniss der Heilsgeschichte. 7. Band. Die Propheten Hesekiel und Daniel. Die Heilsgeschichte vom Exil bis zur Vollendung im Lichte der Propheten. Bremen: Müller, 1891. Pp. viii., 302, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Gredy, H. Kardinal-Erzbischof Albrecht II. von Brandenburg in seinem Verhältnisse zu den Glaubensneurungen. Nach geschichtlichen Urkunden dargestellt. Mainz: Kupferberg, 1891. Pp. iv., 176, 8vo, 2 mk.

Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, bearbeitet von H. J. Holtzmann, R. A. Lipsius, P. W. Schmiedel, H. von Soden. 3. Band, 2. Abtheilung. Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jacobus, Judas. Bearbeitet von H. von Soden. 2. Auflage. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. xii., 216, 8vo, 4 mk.

Harkavy, A. Studien und Mittheilungen aus der kaiserlichen Bibliothek zu St. Petersburg. 5. Theil, Leben und Werke des Saadja Gaon (Said al-Fajjumi, 892–942), Rectors der talmudischen Akademie in Sora. 1. Heft. St. Petersburg, 1891. (6 mk.)

Hase, Karl von. Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage akademischer Vorlesungen. Reformation und gegen Reformation. 3. Theil, 1. Abtheilung. Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. G. Kruger. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1892. Pp. vii., 438, 8vo, 7 mk. (I.–III. 1, 31 mk.).

Hausrath, A. Arnold von Brescia. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1891. Pp. iv., 184, 8vo, 3 mk.

Heilmann, K. Missionskarte der Erde. 1: 50,000,000. Nebst Begleitwort. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. 31, 8vo, 1 mk.

Heintzeler, Th. Erklärung der sämtlichen geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments. Ein Hilfsbuch für geistliche Lehrer, und für das evangelischen Volk überhaupt. 2 Bände. Strassburg i. E.: Verlags-Anstalt, 1891. Pp. 727, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Hopkins, E. H. The Word Opened; or, Materials for Bible Readings. 2d series. London: Marshall, 1892. Pp. 116, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Hughes, Hugh Price, Rev., M.A. Ethical Christianity. A series of sermons. London: Low; New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. xii., 176, 12mo, 3s. 6d.; $1.25.

Jamieson, G. A Revised Theology. The Church as it ought to be, compared with the Church as it is. London: Hodder, 1892. Pp. 316, 8vo, 6s.

Jeremias, F. Tyrus bis zur Zeit Nebukadnezzars. Geschichtliche Skizze mit besonderem Berücksicht der keilschriftliche Quellen. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891. Pp. 48, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Johnson, G. B. Daily Words for Daily Life. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. 80, 32mo, cloth, 30 cts.

Jouvin, L. Le Pessimisme. Paris, 1891. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Julian, John (ed.). A Dictionary of Hymnology. Setting forth the origin and history of Christian hymns of all ages and nations, with special reference to those contained in the hymn-books of English-speaking countries and now in common use; together with biographical and critical notices of their authors and translators and historical articles on national and denominational hymnody, breviaries, missals, primers, psalters, sequences, etc. London: Murray, 1892. Pp. 1026, 8vo, 42s.

Kattenbusch, Ferd., Prof., Dr. Lehrbuch der vergleichenden confessionskunde. 3. Lieferung. (1 Band, Prolegomena und 1. Theil, orthodoxe anatolische Kirche.) Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1892. Pp. xxv., 353–555, 8vo, 5 mk. (1. Band, 12 mk.)

Koch, C. Buddha og den aeldre Buddhisme. (Smaaskrifter til Oplysning for Kristne, udgivne af F. Nielsen. VI. 4.) Kjobenhavn: Schönberg, 1891. Pp. 84, 8vo, 1. Kr. 35re.

Kraus, Franz Xav., Prof., Dr. Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinlande. 2 Theil, Die christlichen Inschriften von der Mitte des 8. bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts. 1. Abtheilung. Die Inschriften der Bisthümer Chur, Basel, Konstanz, Strassburg, Speyer, Worms, Mainz und Metz. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1892. Pp. 160, 4to, 20 mk. (I. und II. 1, 50 mk.)

Kuyper, A. Het sociale vraagstuck en de christelijke religie Rede. Amsterdam: Wormser, 1891. Pp. 77, 8vo, 1fl.

La Broise, R. de. Bossuet et la Bible; étude d'après les documents originaux. Paris: Retaux-Bray, 1891. Pp. lii., 453, 8vo.

Lamar, J. S. First Principles and Perfection; or, the Birth and Growth of a Christian. Cincinnati: Stand. Pub. Co., 1892. Pp. 283, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Langer, O. Sklaverei in Europa während der letzten Jahrhunderte des Mittelalters. Programm. Ostern: Bautzen, 1891. Pp. 46, 4to.

Lavollée, René, Dr. La Morale dans l'histoire. Étude sur les principaux systèmes de philosophie de l'histoire depuis l'antiquité jusqu' à nos jours. Paris: Nourrit, 1891. Pp. iv., 416, 8vo.

Lear, H. L. S. The Light of the Conscience. With introduction by Rev. T. T. Carter. New ed. London: Longmans, 1892. Pp. 252, 32mo, 6s.

Leeke, E. T. Ourselves, our People, our Work. Six addresses, given in the Divinity Schools, Cambridge. London: C. K. Soc., 1892. Pp. 154, 12mo, 2s.

Leendertz, A. C. Het ethisch-evangelisch Standpunkt in het christelijkgodsdienstig geloof. Eene studie op het gebied der godsdienstwijsbegeerte volgens de beginselen der Religionsfilosofie van Immanuel Kant. 2 deelen. Rotterdam: Lotz, 1891. Pp. viii., 276; vi., 298, 8vo, 3.75 fl.

Lefèvre, A. La religion. Paris: Reinwald, 1891. Pp. xli., 587, 18mo. 5 fr.

Leimdörfer, David. Das heilige Schrifteverk Kohelet im Lichte der Geschichte. Neue Forschung über Ecclesiastes, nebst Texte, Uebersetzung, und Kommentar. Hamburg: Fritzsche, 1892. Pp. iii., 151, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Lethaby, W. R. Architecture, Mysticism and Myth. With illustrations. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. x., 272, 12mo, $1.75.

L'Huillier, A. Saint Thomas de Cantorbéry. Tom. 1er. Paris: Palmé, 1891. Pp. xii., 469, 8vo.

Lietz, Hermann. Die Probleme im Begriff der Gesellschaft bei Auguste Comte im Gesamtzusammenhange seines systems. Dissertation. Jena: Fock, 1892. Pp. 97, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

Little, Henry W. Arrows for the King's Archers. Analytic Outline. Addresses upon religious, temperance and social topics, with some courses of addresses for special occasions. For the use of busy and overworked clergymen, layreaders, teachers and parish workers. New York: Whittaker, 1892. Pp. xiv., 149, 12mo, $1.00.

M'Neile, H. Handbook to the Book of Common Prayer. London: Nisbet, 1892. Pp. 144, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Mair, Alexander, D.D. Studies in the Christian Evidences. Second edition, revised and enlarged. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1892. Pp. xv., 396.

Mandalari, M. Istituzioni scolastiche in Turchia. Roma, 1891. Pp. 240, 8vo. (4 mk.)

Manen, W. C. Van. Paulus. II. De brief aan de Romeinen. Leiden: Brill, 1891. Pp. ii., 308, 8vo, 3.25 fl.

Maspero, G. Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria. London: Chapman, 1891. New York: Appleton, 1892. Pp. xv., 376, 12mo, 5s.

Mather, Z. The Christ of the Heart and the Christ of History, and other Sermons. London: Clarke, 1892. Pp. 422, p. 8vo, 5s.

Meschinet de Richemond, D. L. A. L'Église de la Pentecôte. Thèse. Montauban, 1891. Pp. 104, 8vo.

Milligan, W. The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of Our Lord. London and New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. xvii., 374, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.; $2.25.

Mirbt, C. Die Wahl Gregors VII. Marburg: Elwert, 1891. Pp. 56, 4to, 2 mk.

Monod, L. Le Problème de l'autorité. Thèse. Lyon: Imp. nouvelle, 1891. Pp. 100, 8vo.

Montet, F. Le Deutéronome et la question de l'Hexateuque. Étude critique et exégétique sous forme d'introduction et de commentaire du Deutéronome considéré dans ses rapports avec le quatre premiers livres du Pentateuque et Josué. Paris: Fischbacher, 1891. Pp. vi., 612, 8vo, 12 fr.

Müller, F. Max. Anthropological Religion. The Clifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1891. London: Longmans, 1892. Pp. 486, p. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Müller, Th. Étude sur Thomas Guthrie, pasteur écoss ais (1803–73). Thèse. Genève: Georg, 1891. Pp. 109, 8vo, 2 fr.

Murphy, J. B. C. The Chain of our Sins. Being sermons for Lent and Easter. London: Skeffington, 1892. Pp. 68, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Nitzsch, Frdr. Aug. Berth., Prof., Dr. Lehrbuch der evangelischen Dogmatik. 2. Hälfte. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1892. Pp. xvi., 209–628, 8vo, 9.60 mk. (Complete, 14 mk.)

Odom, W. Church of England: Her Principles, Ministry and Sacraments. London: Nisbet, 1892. 3d ed., pp. 230, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Page, Jesse. Samuel Crowther, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. xii., 160, 12mo, 75 cts.

Pike, G. H. The Life and Work of Archibald G. Brown, Philanthropist and Preacher. With an Introduction by Sir S. Arthur Blackwood. London: Passmore, 1892. Pp. 124, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Pompery, E. de. La Morale naturelle et la religion de l'humanité. Paris, 1891. 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Presbyterian Year-Book, 1891–92. London: Simpkin, 1892. Pp. 174, p. 8vo, 6d.

Puaux, Frank. Histoire de l'etablissement des protestants français en suède. Paris: Fischbacher, 1892. Pp. x., 212, 8vo, 5 fr.

Pulpit Commentary. Job. Exposition by Rev. G. Rawlinson; homilies by various authors: Rev. Prof. E. Johnson, Rev. Prof. W. F. Adeney, Rev. R. Green. London: Paul, 1892. Roy. 8vo, 21s.

Rainsford, M. The Song of Solomon. London: Hoby, 1892. Pp. 256, p. 8vo, 4s. (Sermons.)

Records of the Past. Edited by A. H. Sayce. New series, vol. 5. London: Bagster, 1892. Pp. 190, p. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Religious Systems of the World. A contribution to the study of Comparative Religion. A collection of addresses delivered at South Place Institute, now revised and in some cases rewritten by the authors. Together with some others specially written for this volume. Second edition. With several new articles. Vol. 2. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Pp. viii., 324, 8vo, $4.50.

Reynolds, Joseph William, M.A. The Natural History of Immortality. New York: Longmans, 1892. Pp. xxviii. 389, 12mo, $2.25.

Rineri de Rocchi, L. Il Senso etico e l'antropologia. Roma, 1891. Pp. 219, 8vo. (3.50 mk.)

Ritschl, O. Albrecht Ritschls Leben. 1 Band, 1822–64. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. vi., 456, 8vo, 10 mk.

Rituale Wratislaviense ad normam Romani, jussu et auctoritate illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini Georgii, dei et apostolici sedis gratia principis episcopi Wratislavensis editum. Ratisbonæ (Breslau: Aderholz), 1891. Pp. viii., 576, 8vo, 7 mk.

Röhricht, R. Studien zur Geschichte des 5. Kreuzzuges. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1891. Pp. vi., 139, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Roi, J. F. A. de le. Die evangelische Christenheit und die Juden, unter dem Gesichtspunkte der Mission geschichtlich betrachtet. 3. Band. (Schriften des *Institutum judaicum* in Berlin, No. 9.) Berlin: Reuthen, 1891. Pp. vi., 453, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Rondot, N. Les Protestants à Lyon au XVII^{e} siècle. Lyon: Mougin-Rusand, 1892. Pp. 224, 8vo.

Runze, G. Ethik. Encyklopädische Skizzen und Litteraturangaben zur Sittenlehre. I. Praktische ethik. Berlin: Duncker, 1891. Pp. viii., 275, 8vo, 6mk.

Saint-Patrice. Plagiats bibliques. Brahmanisme de Moïse; Bouddhisme de Jesus. Paris: Sauvaître, 1891. Pp. x., 115, 18mo, 2.50 fr.

Sancti Patris nostri et confessoris Theodori Studitis præpositi parva catechesis græcum textum e codicibus multis nunc primum critice descriptum uti et latinam P. J. Harduini interpretationem nondum vulgatam edidit E. Auvray et annotatione historica instruxit A. Tongard. Paris: Lecoffre, 1891. Pp. cxii., 672, 4to, 25 fr.

Savage, B. J., Rev. The Lord's One Baptism. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1892. Pp. 144, 18mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Schaab, A. Pontius Pilatus. Ein Zeitbild. Karlsruhe: Reiff, 1891. Pp. iii., 118, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Schiffini, P. S. Disputationes philosophiæ moralis. 2 vols. Torino, 1891. Pp. 432, 700, 8vo. (10 mk.)

Schling, E. Ueber kirchliche Simultanverhältnisse. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. viii., 97, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Schmalenbach, Th. Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg. Sein Leben und Wirken, nach gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen dargestellt. 3. Band. Nach J. Bachmanns Tode dargestellt von ——. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. viii., 500, 8vo, 7 mk. (Complete, 16 mk.)

Schmid, O. Ueber verschiedene Eintheilungen der heiligen Schrift, insbesondere über die Capitel-Eintheilung Stephan Langtons im XIII. Jahrhunderte Graz: Leuschner, 1891. Pp. 120, 8vo, 5 mk.

Schmoller, O. Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Leiden: Brill, 1891. Pp. viii., 219, 8vo. (3.50 mk.)

Schneider, Wilhelm, Prof., Dr. Die Religion der afrikanischen Völker. (Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nichtchristlichen Religionsgeschichte, Bände 5 und 6.) Münster: Aschendorff, 1892. Pp. 283, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Schulte, J. F. von. Die *Summa Magistri Rufini* zum *Decretum Gratiani.* Mit einer Erörterung über die Bearbeitungen, derselben herausgegeben. Giessen: Roth, 1891. Pp. lxxix., 496, 8vo, 20 mk.

Schultess, Karl. Papst Silvester II. (Gerbert), als Lehrer und Staatsmann. Programm. Hamburg, 1891. Pp. 56, 4to.

Schwarz, G. Justitia imputata? Eine neue Erklärung der entscheidenen Aussprüche des Apostels Paulus über die Rechtfertigung. Heidelberg: Hörning, 1891. Pp. iii., 44, 8vo, 80 pf.

Sdralek, M. Wolfenbüttler Fragmente. Analekten zur Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters aus Wolfenbüttler Handschriften. (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. Herausgegeben von Knöpfler, Schrörs, Sdralek. 1. Band, 2. Heft.) Münster i. W.: Schöningh, 1891. Pp. x., 191, 8vo, 3.40 mk.

Smart, H. T. Thomas Cook's Early Ministry. With incidents and suggestions concerning Christian work. London: Kelly, 1892. Pp. 264. p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Stanton, Vincent Henry, D.D. The Place of Authority in Matters of Religious Belief. New York and London: Longmans, 1892. Pp. xiii., 224, p. 8vo, 6s.; $1.75.

Steinthal. Zur Geschichte Sauls und Davids. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Bücher Samuel. (Wissenschaftliche Beigabe zum IX. Bericht über die Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums in Berlin erstattet vom Curatorium.) Berlin: Rosenthal, 1891. Pp. 17, 4to.

Taylor, William M. Paul the Missionary. London: Burnet, 1892. Pp. 500, p. 8vo, 5s.

Thomas à Kempis. Meditations on the Life of Christ. Translated and edited by the Ven. Archdeacon Wright, M.A., and the Rev. S. Kettlewell, M.A. With the preface by the latter. New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. li, 378, p. 8vo, $1.25.

Tougarde, A. La persécution iconoclaste, d'après la correspondance de Saint Théodore Studite. Paris: Lecoffre, 1891. Pp. 48, 8vo.

Towner, D. B., **Eaton,** T. T., D.D., LL.D., **Simmons,** George H. Hymns New and Old. Revised. For use in all religious services. New York: Revell, 1892. 8vo.

Tyndall, C. H., Rev. Object Sermons in Outline. With numerous illustrations. Introduction by the Rev. A. F. Schauffler, D.D. New York: Revell, 1892. Pp. x., 254, 12mo, $1.00.

Van Dyke, Henry, Rev., D.D. The Church Psalter. One hundred and four Psalms, arranged under subjects for responsive readings. New York: Merrill, 1892. Pp. xiii., 127, 12mo.

Vaughan, C. J., D.D. The Prayers of Jesus Christ. New York: Macmillan, 1892. Cloth, $1.00. (See bibliography for February.)

Vedder, Henry C. A Short History of the Baptists. Philadelphia: Am. Bap. Pub. Soc., 1892. Pp. 245, 12mo, cloth, $1 00.

Verheyen, Boniface F., Rev. General Principles of the Religious Life. New York: Benziger, 1892. 32mo, cloth, 30 cts.

Voorhoeve, Ch. De prediker. Eene praktische bijbelstudie. Amsterdam: Egeling, 1891. Pp. 60, 8vo, .40 fl.

Vox Clamantis. London: Paul, 1892. Pp. 306, p. 8vo, 6s. (On Modern Science and Revelation, Our Lord as the central figure in history, to place Him before us as He appeared to His contemporaries, on Regeneration, Laying on of Hands, etc.)

Warren, R. R. The Kingdom of Christ and the Church of Ireland. London: Hodder, 1892. Pp. 190, p. 8vo, 3s.

Westphal, A. Les Sources du Pentateuque. Étude de critique et d'histoire. II. Le problème historique. Paris: Fischbacher, 1892. Pp. xxxviii., 416, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Wiener, Chrn., Prof., Dr. Die Freiheit des Willens. Festrede. Karlsruhe: Fock, 1892. Pp. 24, 8vo, 1 mk.

Winckler, H. Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament. 1. Lieferung. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1891. Pp. 48, 8vo, 2 mk

Wlislocki, Heinrich von, Dr. Volksglaube und religiöser Brauch der Zigeuner. Vorwiegend nach eigenen Ermittlungen. (Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nichtchristlichen Religionsgeschichte, Band 4.) Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1892. Pp. xiv., 184, 8vo, 3 mk.

Woltjer, J. De wetenschap van den logos. Rede. Amsterdam: Wormser, 1891. Pp. 91, 8vo, .70 fl.

CHRONICLE.

(*Closes on the 20th of each month.*)

Jan. 20-22. Final conference of the Presbyterian General Assembly's Committee, with the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary, concerning the relation of the Seminary to the General Assembly. The result will be made known first in the committee's report to the General Assembly in May.

Jan. 21. Woman's Union Missionary Society of America celebrated its thirty-first anniversary at the Bible House, New York City.

Jan. 22. Adjournment *sine die* of the Presbyterian General Assembly's Committee on the Revision of the Confession.

Feb. 2-4. Winter Missionary Conference, under the auspices of the American Baptist Missionary Union, at Des Moines, Ia. The exercises included addresses on "Am I My Brother's Keeper?" "The Holy Spirit the Author of the Foreign Mission Enterprise;" "The Home Relation to Foreign Missions;" "The Stewardship of the Mystery;" "The Missionary Education of the Church;" "Two Patterns of Life;" "Young People's Work in Missions;" "Students in Relation to Missions;" "The Ground of Missionary Obligation;" "Laymen in World Evangelization;" "Crises in Missions," and "The Purpose of the Ages."

Feb. 3. Massachusetts Sunday-school Association's Convention at Springfield.

Feb. 7-12. Baptist Workers' Convention at Nashville.

Feb. 9-17. Stone Lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary by the Rev. S. H. Kellogg, D.D., of Toronto, Canada, on "Modern Theories of the Origin and Development of Religion." Lect. 1. What is Religion? Lect. 2. Religion and Natural Descent. Lect. 3. Mr. Spencer's Ghost Theory. Lect. 4. Max Müller on the Origin of Religion. Lect. 5. The True Genesis of Religion. Lect. 6. Development of Religion; Sin as a Factor. Lect. 7. Order of Religious Development; Historic Facts. Lect. 8. Shemitic Monotheism; conclusion.

Feb. 18-21. Annual meeting Y. M. C. A., New York State, at Auburn.

A new Presbyterian weekly is to be published in Cleveland, O. It will be "progressive," though "independent." The reason assigned for founding the paper is that none but strictly conservative views can get admission to the columns of the *Interior* and the *Herald and Presbyter.*

It is proposed to erect to Cardinal Newman a monument on Broad Street, Oxford. This has called forth a vigorous protest, because the proposed site is "in immediate sight of the spot where Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer were burned at the stake."

In the English Church the use of the cope, mitre, and staff is to be revived. Bishop Ellicott is a leader in the movement.

An overture has been presented to the Synodical Committee of the Presbyterian Church of England on behalf of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Churches, desiring closer relations. It is expected that the Synod will appoint representatives to meet a committee from the Welsh churches.

OBITUARY.

Adler, Rev. Liebman (Jewish), at Chicago, January 29, aged 80. He came to this country from Germany in 1854; was rabbi of a congregation in Detroit, moving to Chicago in 1870. He was the oldest Jewish pastor in the West.

Anderledy, Very Rev. Anthony M., General of the Society of Jesus, at Rome, Italy, January 19.

Backus, Rev. Jonathan Trumbull (Presbyterian), D.D., S.T.D. (Union College, 1847). He was born January 27, 1809; graduated from Columbia College, 1827, and from Princeton Theological Seminary, 1830; was called to a pastorate in Schenectady, N. Y., 1832, which he retained till he retired in 1873. He was the first moderator of the General Assembly of the reunited Presbyterian Church, held in Philadelphia, 1870.

Carter, Rev. John Pym (Presbyterian), D.D., at Washington, D. C., January 12, aged 80. He was the first president of Ashmun Institute, now Lincoln College, and was for thirty years stated clerk of the Baltimore Synod.

Chamberlain, Rev. Thomas (Church of England), Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, January 20, aged 82. He was ordained in 1832, and became rural dean of Oxford, 1844. For twenty-one years he was editor of the *Ecclesiastic*, and wrote "The Theory of Christian Worship," "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," and "The Seven Ages of the Church."

Elliott, Rev. Charles (Presbyterian), D.D. (Ohio University, 1861), LL.D., at Easton, Pa., February 14, aged 76. He became Professor of Belles-lettres at the Western University of Pennsylvania. 1847; from 1849 to 1863 he was Professor of Greek Literature at Miami University; Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, 1863–82, and succeeded the Rev. Dr. Coleman at Lafayette College as Professor of Hebrew, 1882 He has published "The Sabbath," "The Inspiration of the Scriptures," and "The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch."

Fraser, Rev. Donald (English Presbyterian), D.D. (Aberdeen University, 1872), in London, February 13, aged 66. He was born at Inverness, Scotland, graduated at Aberdeen, 1842, studied divinity at Knox College, Montreal, and New College, Edinburgh; was ordained and took a charge in Montreal, 1851; went to the Free High Church, Inverness, 1859; was called to the Marylebone Presbyterian Church, London, 1870; since that time has been a most prominent figure in the English Presbyterian Church. Among his writings are "Baptism; or, a Contribution to Christian Union;" "The Fourth Commandment; its Moral Obligations;" "Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Holy Scriptures," three series, which have reached a fourth edition; and "Inspiration of the Bible, what it Includes."

Fry, Rev. Benjamin St. James (Methodist Episcopal), D.D. (Quincy College), in St. Louis, Mo., February 5, aged 67. Dr. Fry entered the ministry in 1847; during the war served as chaplain; in 1872 was elected editor of the *Central Christian Advocate*, to which position he was re-elected yearly till his death. He was the author of "Property Consecrated," and "Lives" of Bishops Whatcoat, McKendree, George and Roberts.

Hawkins, Rev. Richard, General Missionary Superintendent of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America, at Olean, January 18, aged 57.

Howard, Rev. Rowland Bailey (Congregationalist), D.D., secretary of the American Peace Association, at Rome, Italy, aged 57. He left the profession of law for the ministry; held pastorates in Maine, Illinois, New Jersey and Massachusetts; was assistant editor of *The Advance*, 1875–82; and afterward editor of the *American Advocate of Peace and Arbitration*, the journal of the society which he served as secretary.

Kingsbury, Rev. Addison (Presbyterian), D.D. (Marietta College, 1854), at Marietta, O., January 25, aged 92. He was graduated from Andover Theological Seminary in 1828; entered the Home Mission field the same year in Ohio; took a charge at Putnam, O., 1839, which charge he resigned 1878, being elected pastor emeritus. Since 1861 he had been a trustee of Lane Theological Seminary.

Lagarde, Paul Anton de (German Protestant), Ph.D. (Berlin, 1849), D.D. (Halle, 1868), Professor of Oriental Languages at Göttingen, December 22, 1891, aged 64. After teaching in various schools in Schleusingen and Berlin, he was called, in 1869, to Göttingen. He was the author of over sixty works, and edited the *Septuagint*, which, however, he left only half completed.

Manly, Rev. Basil (Baptist), D.D. (University of Alabama, 1859), LL.D. (Agricultural College, Alabama, 1874), at Louisville, January 29, aged 66. He was Professor of Biblical Introduction and Old Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Seminary, 1859; President of Georgetown College, Ky., 1871, and Professor in the Southern Baptist Seminary since 1879. He edited, with his father, "Baptist Psalmody," and published "A Call to the Ministry."

Möller, Ernst Wilhelm, D.D. (Greifswald, 1863), Ph.D. (Halle, 1883), since 1873 Professor of Church History at Kiel, died January 8, aged 64. He published in German (in De Wette's series, 3d ed.) Commentaries on Revelation, and on the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, Timothy and Hebrews. His most important work is a History of the Cosmology of the Greek Church to the time of Origen.

Phillips, Rev. George (Church of England), D.D. (Cambridge, 1858), President of Queen's College, Cambridge, February 5, aged 87. He was ordained priest in 1831, and appointed fellow and tutor of his college the same year; became rector at Sandon, 1846, and President of Queen's College, 1857. Among his printed works are "A Syriac Grammar," "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Psalms," "The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle," and "Sermons on Old Testament Messianic Texts."

Philpott, Rt. Rev. Henry (Church of England), D.D. (Cambridge, 1847), January 10, aged 84. He was ordained priest, 1833; was chaplain to the Prince Consort, 1854–60; Vice-chancellor of the University, 1846 and 1856; consecrated Bishop of Worcester, 1861; since that time he has been Clerk of the Closet to the Queen. He resigned his bishopric in 1890.

Round, Rev. John Emory (Methodist Episcopal), D.D., January 10, aged 56. Was assistant editor, and afterward editor-in-chief of *Zion's Herald;* organized a company of volunteers which he, as captain, led to war; after the war was made principal of Centenary Biblical Institute (now Morgan College), which position he held till 1882; till 1887 was in charge of instruction there.

Spurgeon, Rev. Charles Haddon (Baptist), at Mentone, France, January 31, aged 57. He began to preach when 16, and in 1853 was called to the New Park Street Church, Southwark. Increased congregations compelled the erection of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, seating upward of six thousand persons. In 1856 he founded the Pastors' College for training men to the Baptist ministry, and in 1867 the Stockwell Orphanage. Since 1865 he has edited the weekly *Sword and Trowel.* Mr. Spurgeon belonged to the "Open Communion" wing of his denomination, and in 1887 withdrew from the Baptist Union, on the ground that that body was tolerating error. His best-known work, outside of the many volumes of sermons, is his "Treasury of David, containing an Exposition of the Book of Psalms," 6 volumes.

Stearns, Rev. Lewis F. (Congregationalist), D.D. (College New Jersey, 1881), at Bangor, Me., February 9, aged 45. He was pastor at Norwood, N. J., 1873–76; Professor of History and Belles-lettres at Albion College, Mich., 1876–79; became Professor of Systematic Theology at Bangor Theological Seminary, 1880. Last year he declined the professorship of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York City. He was the author of "The Evidence of Christian Experience; being the Ely Lectures for 1890."

Taylor, Rev. Charles H. (Presbyterian), D.D., in Brooklyn, January 21, aged 69. He served churches at Ballston Centre, N. Y., Cambridge, Leroy and Noble streets, Brooklyn, resigning from his last charge in 1886. Dr. Taylor was moderator of the Brooklyn Presbytery during the trial of Dr. Talmage in 1884.

CALENDAR.

Mar. 2. "Alliance Day" at all seminaries connected with the Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance.

Mar. 9–10. Missionary meeting in Boston, under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and the Congregational Young People's Societies. Among the speakers will be Dr. Behrends, of Brooklyn, Dr. Virgin, of New York, President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, and Mrs. Alice Freeman Palmer, of Wellesley College.

Mar. 22–*Apr.* 12. The Morse Lectureship on the Relations of the Bible to the Sciences, in the Union Theological Seminary in New York, will be occupied this year by the Rev. A. M. Principal Fairbairn, D.D., of Mansfield College, Oxford, England. The subject of the course will be "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology." The several lectures are announced as follows: 1. The Return to the Christ of History, March 21st; 2. The Law of Development in Theology, March 22d; 3. The Place of Christ in Universal History, March 28th; 4. The New Testament Interpretation of Christ, March 29th; 5. Christ the Interpretation of God, April 4th; 6. The Father and the Incarnation, April 5th; 7. Christ and the Church, April 11th; 8. Christ and the Scriptures, April 12th.

Apr. 20–21. Annual meeting of the Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society in Boston, at the Warren Avenue Church.

BR
1
C635
v.5

Christian literature

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY